



# भारत का राजपत्र

## The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 10] नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, मार्च 8, 1980/फाल्गुन 18, 1901  
No 10] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, MARCH 8, 1980/PHALGUNA 18, 1901

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके  
Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड(ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़ कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्यक्षेत्र प्रशासनों को छोड़ कर)  
केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं

Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India  
(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities (other than the  
Administrations of Union Territories)

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 16 जनवरी, 1980

का०प्रा० 489.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 227-हर्दा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र में चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री पुनम चन्द नाथू राम, अध्यक्ष, नगर पालिका परिषद, हर्दा निवासी—हर्दा, तहसील—हर्दा, जिला—होशंगाबाद (मध्य प्रदेश)] लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित समय के अन्दर तथा रीति से अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं,

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार द्वारा दिये गये अभ्यावेदन पर विचार करने के पश्चात्, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री पुनम चन्द नाथूराम को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरक्षित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० म० प्र०-वि०स०/227/77]

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

ORDER

New Delhi, the 16th January, 1980

S.O. 489.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Punam Chand Nathuram, President, Municipal Council, Harda (R/o Harda, Tehsil Harda, District—Hoshangabad, Madhya Pradesh) a contesting candidate for general election to the Madhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in June 1977 from 227-Harda constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses within the time and in the manner as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, after considering the representation made by the said candidate, the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Punam Chand Nathuram to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MP-LA/227/77]

### आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 28 जनवरी, 1980

कां०आ० 490—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1977 में हुए मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 5-समावली निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री मथुरी, ग्राम—कुक्थारी, तहसील—सम्बाह, जिला—मुरैता, मध्य प्रदेश, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, समयक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः, अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री मथुरी को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[मं०प्र०—वि०सं०/5/77]

### ORDER

New Delhi, the 28th January, 1980

S.O. 490.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Mathuri, Village Kukthari, Teh. Ambah, Distt. Morena, Madhya Pradesh a contesting candidate for general election to the Madhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in 1977 from 5-Sumawali constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Mathuri to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[MP/LA/5/77]

नई दिल्ली, 30 जनवरी, 1980

कां०आ० 491—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1977 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 67-कटुमार निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री देवी लाल, ग्राम—मैपुर पक्षार, पो० आ०—मोहवा रोड, मन्डावर, (अजमेर), राजस्थान, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार द्वारा दिये गये अभ्यवेदन पर विश्वास करने के पश्चात्, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री देवीलाल को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[मं० राज०—वि०सं०/67/77(34)]

New Delhi, the 30th January, 1980

S.O. 491. Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Devi Lal, Village Saipur Pakhar, P.O. Mohuwa Road, Mandawar (Alwar), Rajasthan, a contesting candidate for general election to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly held in 1977 from 67-Kathumar constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, after considering the representation made by the said candidate, the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Devi Lal to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ/LA/67/77(34)]

कां०आ० 492.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1977 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 75-वैर निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री नंगाराम, ग्राम सेन्दली, पो० रंधीरगढ़, तहसील वैर, जिला भरतपुर, राजस्थान लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा गीति में दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः, उक्त उमीदवार ने, समयक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री नंगा राम को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[मं० राज०—वि०सं०/75/77(35)]

S.O. 492.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Nanga Ram, Village Sendali P.O. Randhir Garh, Teh. Weir, District Bharatpur (Rajasthan a contesting candidate for general election to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly held in 1977 from 75-Weir constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses in the manner as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Nanga Ram to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ/LA/75/77(35)]

कां०आ० 493.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1977 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 80-कनौली निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री रामजी लाल, फटाकोट, कनौली (राजस्थान) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यत्न उक्त उम्मीदवार द्वारा दिये गये अभ्यावेदन पर विचार करने के पश्चात् निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्याख्यान नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री रामजी लाल को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० राज०-वि०स०/80/77(36)]

**S.O. 493.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ramji Lal, Phottakot, Karauli (Rajasthan), a contesting candidate for general election to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly held in 1977 from 80-Karauli constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, after considering the representation made by the said candidate, the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ramji Lal to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ/1A/80/77(36)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 2 फरवरी, 1980

**का०आ० 494.**—यत्न, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1977 में हुए मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 194-जबलपुर कन्टोमेंट निर्वाचन क्षेत्र में चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री मिथी लाल, 1145, द्वारका नगर, जबलपुर (मध्य प्रदेश), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वर्ति बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित आयोग निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असमर्थ रहे हैं ।

और यत्न, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्याख्यान नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री मिथी लाल को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० म०प्र०-वि०स०/194/77]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 2nd February, 1980

**S.O. 494.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Mishri Lal, 1145, Dwarka Nagar, Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh), a contesting candidate for general election to the Madhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in 1977 from 194-Jabalpur Cantonment constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Mishri Lal to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MP/LA/194/77]

आदेश

**का०आ० 495.**—यत्न, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1977 में हुए मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 194-जबलपुर कन्टोमेंट निर्वाचन क्षेत्र में चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री पी० मरैया, न्यू भारत टेलर्स, रंजी बाजार, जबलपुर (मध्य प्रदेश) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वर्ति बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित आयोग निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असमर्थ रहे हैं ;

और यत्न, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर, भी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्याख्यान नहीं है ;

अतः अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री पी० मरैया को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० म०प्र०-वि०स०/194/77]

ORDER

**S.O. 495.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri P. Maraiya, New Bharat Tailors, Ranjhi Bazar, Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh), a contesting candidate for general election to the Madhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in 1977 from 194-Jabalpur Cantonment constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri P. Maraiya to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MP/LA/194/77]

आदेश

**का०आ० 496.**—यत्न निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1977 में हुए मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 194-जबलपुर कन्टोमेंट निर्वाचन क्षेत्र में चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री श्रीराम, आनंद नगर, रंजी, जबलपुर (मध्य प्रदेश) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वर्ति बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित समय के अन्दर तथा रीति में अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असमर्थ रहे हैं ;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार द्वारा दिये गये अभ्यवेदन पर विचार करने के पश्चात्, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री श्रीराम को संसद् के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं०—म०प्र०—वि०स०/194/77]

#### ORDER

**S.O. 496.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Shree Ram, Azad Nagar, Ranjhi, Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh), a contesting candidate for general election to the Madhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in 1977 from 194-Jabalpur Cantonment constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses within the time and in the manner as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas, after considering the representation made by the said candidate, the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Shree Ram to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MP/LA/194/77]

नई दिल्ली, 6 फरवरी, 1980

**का०प्रा० 497.**—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए राजस्थान विधानसभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 139-मावली निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्रीमती गुलाब बाई, 18, पंचवती, उदयपुर (राजस्थान) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे है ;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्रीमती गुलाब बाई को संसद् के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० राज०-वि०स०/139/77(37)]

New Delhi, the 6th February, 1980

**S.O. 497.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Smt. Gulab Bai, 18-Panchwati, Udaipur (Rajasthan), a contesting candidate for general election to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly held in 1977 from 139-Mavli constituency, has failed to lodge an account of her election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that she has no good reason or justification for the failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Smt.

Gulab Bai to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ/LA/139/77(37)]

नई दिल्ली, 22 फरवरी, 1980

**का०प्रा० 498.**—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 29-गुना निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री अजमेर सिंह गोविन्दसिंह, ग्राम—बहुताघाट, पो०—पगारा, तहसील व जिला गुना (मध्य प्रदेश) लोक सभा प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे है ;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री अजमेर सिंह गोविन्द सिंह को संसद् के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० म०प्र०-वि०स०/29/77]

आदेश से,

ओ० ना० नागर, अवग्र सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd February, 1980

**S.O. 498.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ajmersingh Govind Singh, Village Behtaghat, Post Pagar, Tehsil and District Guna (Madhya Pradesh) a contesting candidate for general election to the Madhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in June 1977 from 29-Guna constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses as required by the representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ajmersingh Govind Singh to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MP/LA/29/77]

By order,

O. N. NAGAR, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 28 जनवरी, 1980

**का०प्रा० 499.**—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए तमिलनाडु विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 71 अष्टमिन्दियम सभा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री जे० वी० कीर्ती, सुपुत्र जय राव, संख्या 73, इन्स्टीटूट बिकोडूर, जिला दक्षिण अर्काट, (तमिलनाडु) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे है ;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री जे. वी. कीर्थी को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० तमिल-वि० सं०/71/77(47)]

## ORDERS

New Delhi, the 28th January, 1980

**S.O. 499.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri J. V. Keerthy, S/o Jaya Rao, No. 73 East Street Tirukoilur, District South Arcot (Tamil Nadu), a contesting candidate for general election to the Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 71-Rishivardiam assembly constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri J. V. Keerthy to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. TN-LA/71/77(47)]

**का० प्रा० 500**—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए तमिलनाडु विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 101-मेट्टुपालयम सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री आर० मल्लिकार्जुनन, 104, ए-3, सिरुमुगायपुदुर, शिरुमुगई, जिला कोयम्बटूर, पिन कोड 641203 लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे है ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री आर० मल्लिकार्जुनन को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० तमिल -वि० सं०/101/77(48)]

**S.O. 500.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri R. Mallikarjunan, 104-A3, Sirumugaipudur, Sirumugai Post, Coimbatore District, Pin Code-641302, a contesting candidate for general election to the Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 101-Mettupalayam assembly constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses at all as required by the representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri R. Mallikarjunan to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. TN-LA/101/77(48)]

**का० प्रा० 501**—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए तमिलनाडु विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 159-लालगुडी सभा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री एस० कंडास्वामी, गांधी नगर, दलमाईपुरम लालगुडी तालुक, जिला तिरुचिरापल्ली (तमिलनाडु) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री एस० कंडास्वामी को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० तमिल-वि० सं०/159/77(49)]

**S.O. 501.** Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri S. Kandaswamy, Gandhi Nagar, Dalmiapuram, Lalgudi Taluk, Tiruchirappalli District, (Tamil Nadu), a contesting candidate for general election to the Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 159-Lalgudi assembly constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri S. Kandaswamy, to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. TN-LA/159/77-(49)]

नई दिल्ली, 30 जनवरी, 1980

**का० प्रा० 502**—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए तमिलनाडु विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 9—व्यालाराय नगर सभा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री सी० वेलायुधम, संख्या 19 वेस्ट स्ट्रीट, अर्वाडी नगर मद्रास-94 लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित रीति में अपने निर्वाचनों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

श्रीर, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार द्वारा दिये गये अभ्यावेदन पर विचार करने के पश्चात् निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्यायीक्षित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री सी० वेलयुधम की सदन के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० तमिल-वि० सं०/9/77]

New Delhi, the 30th January, 1980

**S.O. 502.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri C. Velayudham, No. 19, West Street, Avvai Nagar, Madras-94, a contesting candidate for general election to the Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 9-Theagarayanagar constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses in the manner required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, after considering the representation made by the said candidate, the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri C. Velayudham to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. TN-LA/9/77(50)]

नई दिल्ली, 1 फरवरी, 1980

**का० प्रा० 503.**—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए तमिलनाडु विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 107-परूर सभा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री ए० पलानीस्वामी, 8/192 कुरुमबापालायम मादुकुराई डाकघर, कोयम्बटूर 641105 (तमिलनाडु) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में सफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्बन्ध सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्यायीक्षित्य नहीं है।

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री ए० पलानीस्वामी को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[संख्या तमिल-वि० सं०/107/77 (51)]

New Delhi, the 1st February, 1980

**S.O. 503.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri A. Palaniswamy, 8/192 Kurumbapalayam, Madukurai Post Coimbatore-641105 (Tamil Nadu), a contesting candidate for general election to the Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 107-Perur assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri A. Palaniswamy, to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. TN-LA/107/77(51)]

नई दिल्ली, 1 फरवरी, 1980

**का० प्रा० 504.**—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए तमिलनाडु विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 40—नरचामपल्ली सभा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री एम० रामास्वामी नरचामपट्टी गांव, डाकघर मृमीडीकामपट्टी तिरुपट्टूर तालुक, जिला उत्तर अर्कोट (तमिलनाडु) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्बन्ध सूचना दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्यायीक्षित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री एम० रामास्वामी को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० तमिल-वि० सं०/40/77(52)]

New Delhi, the 4th February, 1980

**S.O. 504.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri M. Ramaswami, Narchampatty Village Gummidikampatty Post, Tirupattur Taluk, North Arcot District (Tamil Nadu), a contesting candidate for general election to the Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 40-Narampalli assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri M. Ramaswami to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. TN-LA/40/77(52)]

**का० प्रा० 505.**—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए तमिलनाडु विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 202-कडालाडी सभा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री एम० वालामुर्गी, नदर स्ट्रीट रामनाथपुरम (तमिलनाडु) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित गति ने अपने निर्वाचनों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

## ORDER

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1980

श्री. यत. उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्पर्क सूचना दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस अशक्यता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस अशक्यता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री एम. वलामपुरी को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० तमिल-वि० सं०/202/77/53]

आदेश से,

समीश चन्द्र जैन, अवर सचिव

**S.O. 505.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri M. Valanpuri, Nadar Street, Ramanathapura (Tamil Nadu), a contesting candidate for general election to the Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 202-Kadaladi Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses in the manner as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri M. Valampuri to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. TN-LA/202/77(53)]

By order,

S. C. JAIN, Under Secy.

## आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1980

का० आ० 506.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1977 में हुए हिमाचल प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 46-नगरोटा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री जय किशन, ग्राम अम्बरी, पो० आ० सगान, तह० तथा जिला कावड़ा (हिमाचल प्रदेश) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वर्धन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार द्वारा दिये गये अपवादों पर विचार करने के पश्चात्, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस अशक्यता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री जय किशन को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० हि० प्र०-वि० सं०/46/77 (6)]

**S.O. 506.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Jai Kisban, Village Ambori, P.O. Malan, Tehsil and District Kangra (Himachal Pradesh) a contesting candidate for general election to the Himachal Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in 1977 from 46-Nagrota constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas after considering the representation made by the said candidate, the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Jai Kisban to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. HP/LA/46/77(6)]

## आदेश

का० आ० 507 —यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 59-बिसालपुर निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री हरनन्दन प्रसाद गंगवार, ग्राम ब पोस्ट परासी उर्फ परासिया जिला पीलीभीत (उत्तर प्रदेश) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वर्धन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने सम्पर्क सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस अशक्यता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस अशक्यता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री हरनन्दन प्रसाद गंगवार को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० उ० प्र० वि० सं०/59/77(65)]

## ORDER

**S.O. 507.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Harnandan Prasad Gangwar, Village and Post Office Parasi urf Parasia, District Pilibhit (Uttar Pradesh) a contesting candidate for general election to the (Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 59-Bisalpur constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Harnandan Prasad Gangwar to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/59/77 (65)]

का० आ० 508.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 109—रायबरेली निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री राम आसरे, ग्राम व पोस्ट नकफुलहा, जिला रायबरेली (उत्तर प्रदेश) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री राम आसरे को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० उ० प्र०-वि० सं०/109/77 (67)]

S.O. 508.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ram Asrey, Village and Post Nakhphulha, District Rae-Barilly (Uttar Pradesh) a contesting candidate for general election to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 109, Rae-Barilly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ram Asrey to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/109/77 (67)]

का० आ० 509.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 180 धुरियापुर निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री मधुबन, ग्राम मझड़ा पोस्ट बेलघाट, जिला गोरखपुर (उत्तर प्रदेश) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री मधुबन को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० उ० प्र०-वि० सं०/180/77 (68)]

S.O. 509.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Madhuban, Village Maraha, P. O. Belghat, District Gorakhpur (Uttar Pradesh), a contesting candidate for general election to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 180-Dhuriapur constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Madhuban to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/180/77 (68)]

नई दिल्ली, 14 फरवरी, 1980

का० आ० 510.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1977 में हुए हिमाचल प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 40—ज्वालामुखी निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री कश्मीर सिंह, ग्राम माहर, पो० लाग्रु अब्रोल, तहसील बेहरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हिमाचल प्रदेश) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार द्वारा दिये गये अभ्यावेदन पर विचार करने के पश्चात्, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री कश्मीर सिंह को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० हि० प्र०-वि० सं०/40/70 (7)]

New Delhi, the 14th February, 1980

S.O. 510.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Kashmir Singh, Village Mahar, P.O. Lagru-Abrol, Tehsil Dehra, District Kangra, (Himachal Pradesh), a contesting candidate for general election to the Himachal Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in 1977 from 40-Jawalamukhi constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Kashmir Singh to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. HP/LA/40/77(7)]



का० प्रा० 511.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1977 में हुए लोक सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 85—हार्द्वार (ग्र०जा०) निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री गंगा शरण, बालमीकी बस्ती, कनखल, हरिद्वार लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्घीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रयत्न स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायीचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री गंगा शरण को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० उ० प्र०लो० सं०/85/77(6)]

S.O. 511.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ganga Sharan, Balmiki Basti, Kankhal, Hardwar, a contesting candidate for general election to the House of the People held in 1977 from 85-Hardwar (SC) constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all, as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ganga Sharan to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-HP/85/77 (6)]

का० प्रा० 512.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 5-सिकटा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री गोपाल गिरी, ग्राम मेघवल मठियां, थाना रामनगर, जिला पश्चिम चम्पारन, बिहार, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्घीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रयत्न स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायीचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री गोपाल गिरी को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० बिहार वि० सं० 5/77 (138)]

S.O. 512.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Gopal Giri, Village-Meghwal Mathia, Thana, Ram Nagar, Distt. West-Champaran Bihar, a contesting candidate for general election to Bihar Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 5-Sikta constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all, as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Gopal Giri to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/5/77 (138)]

का० प्रा० 513.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 5-सिकटा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री बैद्यनाथ ठाकुर, ग्राम तथा डा० मरजदवा, थाना मैनाटाड़, जिला पश्चिम चम्पारन, बिहार, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्घीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रयत्न स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायीचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री बैद्यनाथ ठाकुर को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० बिहार-वि० सं० 5/77(139)]

S.O. 513.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Baidya Nath Thakur, Village and P. O. Marjadwa, Thana, Mainatand Distt. West Champaran, Bihar, a contesting candidate for general election to Bihar Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 5-Sikta constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all, as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, after considering the representation made by the said candidate, the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Baidya Nath Thakur, to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/5/77 (139)]

का० प्रा० 514.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 281—बाधामारा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री रामेश्वर सिंह, गोविन्दपुर, पो० सोनार बीठ, जिला धनबाद, बिहार, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्घीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रयत्न स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायीचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री रामेश्वर सिंह को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रादेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० बिहार-वि० सं०/281/77(140)]

**S.O. 514.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Rameshwar Singh, Gobindpur, P. O. Sonardih, Dhanbad, Bihar, a contesting candidate for general election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 281-Baghmara constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all, as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Rameshwar Singh, to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/281/77(140)]

**का० प्रा० 515.**—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 281—बाघमारा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री जकीरुद्दीन, पुराना शहर, दाउद नगर, थाना भंजल, दाउद नगर, जिला श्रीरंगारवाद, बिहार, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं,

और उसका पता मालूम न होने के कारण उनकी असफलता के लिए कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण की सूचना अविनरित वापिस आ गई है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री जकीरुद्दीन को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रादेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० बिहार-वि० सं०/281/77(141)]

**S.O. 515.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Jaffiruddin, Purana Shahar, Daud Nagar, Thana Anchal, Daud Nagar, District Aurangabad, Bihar, a contesting candidate for general election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 for 281-Baghmara constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all, as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the notice to show reason or explanation for the failure has been received back undelivered as his whereabouts are unknown;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Jaffiruddin to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/281/77 (141)]

**का० प्रा० 516.**—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 183—खागड़िया निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्रीमति निर्मला देवी, गुलजार बाग, पटना मिटी, जिला पटना, बिहार, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं,

और, उसका पता मालूम न होने के कारण उनकी असफलता के लिए कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण की सूचना अविनरित वापिस आ गई है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्रीमति निर्मला देवी को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रादेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० बिहार-वि० सं०/183/77(142)]

**S.O. 516.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shrimati Nirmala Devi, Gulzar Bagh, Patna City, Distt. Patna, Bihar, a contesting candidate for general election to the Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 183-Khagaria constituency, has failed to lodge an account of her election expenses at all, as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the notice to show reason or explanation for the failure has been received back undelivered as her whereabouts are unknown;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Smt. Nirmala Devi to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/183/77(142)]

नई दिल्ली, 15 फरवरी, 1980

**का० प्रा० 517.**—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 292-जमशेदपुर (पश्चिमी) निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री कमला कान्त मिश्रा, नया बाजार डिस्टेंसरी रोड, पो० जुगसलाई, जिला सिंहभूम, बिहार, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्बन्ध सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्यायोजित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री कमला कान्त मिश्रा को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रादेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० बिहार-वि० सं० 292/77 (143)]

प्रावेश से,

के० गणेशन, सचिव

New Delhi, the 15th February, 1980

**S.O. 517.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Kamala Kant Mishra, Naya Bazar Dispensary Road, Post-Jugsalai, Jamshedpur, Distt. Singhbhum, Bihar, a contesting candidate for general election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 292-Jamshedpur (West) constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all, as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Kamala Kant Mishra to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/292/77(143)]

K. GANESAN, Secy.

विधि, न्याय और कम्पनी कार्य मंत्रालय

(विधि कार्य विभाग)

सूचनाएं

नई दिल्ली, 21 फरवरी, 1980

क्रा०क्रा० 518.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा, यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री बी०डी० शिनोय एडवोकेट, 97 "सतनाम" कफे परेड, बम्बई 400005 ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अन्तर्गत एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे मज़गांव, कफे परेड तथा महा बम्बई के कोलाबा क्षेत्र में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया जाए।

2. उक्त व्यक्ति की नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इन सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[नं० 5(15)/80-न्या०]

# MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS

(Department of Legal Affairs)  
NOTICES

New Delhi, the 21st February, 1980

S.O. 518.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956, that application has been made to the said Authority, under rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri B.D. Shenoy, Advocate 92 "Satnam", Cuffe Parade, Bombay-400005 for appointment as a Notary to practise in Mazagaon and Cuffe Parade, Colaba areas of Greater Bombay.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this Notice.

[No. 5(15)/80-Judl.]

क्रा०क्रा० 519.—नोटरी नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री एन्थोनी डी० कार्स्टा, अधिवक्ता और नोटरी, 21/12 महात्मा गांधी रोड, बंगलूर-560001 ने उक्त नियम के नियम 8 के अन्तर्गत उक्त प्राधिकारी को आवेदन किया है कि नोटरी के रूप में विधि व्यवसाय करने के उनके क्षेत्र को बंगलूर से बढ़ाकर सम्पूर्ण भारत कर दिया जाए।

2. यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त व्यक्ति के नोटरी के रूप में विधि व्यवसाय करने के क्षेत्र के बढ़ाए जाने पर कोई आपत्ति है तो वह इस सूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से चौदह दिन के भीतर मुझे अपनी आपत्ति लिखित रूप में भेज दें।

[नं० एफ० 5/5/80-न्या०]

के०सी०डी० गंगवानी, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

S.O. 519.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956, that application has been made to the said Authority, under rule 8A of the said Rules, by Shri Anthony De Costa, Advocate and Notary 21/12 Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bangalore-560001 for extension of his area of practice from Bangalore to the whole of India.

2. Any objection to the extension of area of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this Notice.

[No. F. 5/5/80-Judl.]

K. C. D. GANGWANI, Competent Authority

नियम मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 19 फरवरी, 1980

क्रा०क्रा० 520.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 193 के परन्तुक के खण्ड (ii ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा तांमार्शे रेगियार ट्रांसपोर्ट कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, विल्लुपुत्तम द्वारा, सरकारी राजपत्र में इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से पूर्व जारी किए गए डिबेंचरों और ऐसी तारीख के पश्चात् जारी किये जाने वाले डिबेंचरों को, उक्त खण्ड के प्रयोजन के लिये तमिलनाडु सरकार की, कर्मकार सहयोग योजना के भागस्वरूप में निर्निर्दिष्ट करती है:

परन्तु—

- (क) ऐसे डिबेंचरों की मूलधन की वापसी अदायगी या ब्याज की अदायगी के लिये किसी सरकार ने प्रत्याभूति न दी हो;
- (ख) ऐसे डिबेंचर केवल व्यष्टियों का जिनसे दो या दो से अधिक व्यष्टि संयुक्त रूप से सम्मिलित हों, जारी किए गए हों;
- (ग) ऐसे डिबेंचर इस शर्त के अधीन रहते हुए जारी किए गए हों कि खण्ड (ख) में वर्णित व्यष्टियों को छोड़कर किसी व्यक्ति को अन्तर्लिखित नहीं हो सकेंगे;
- (घ) ऐसे डिबेंचरों पर ब्याज बारह प्रतिशत वार्षिक से अधिक नहीं हो; और
- (ङ) ऐसे ब्याज से होने वाली आय की कुल रकम जो कि प्रत्येक कर्मचारी या भूतपूर्व कर्मचारी के संबंध में किसी विधाय वर्ष के दौरान जमा या भ्रदा की गई है या जिसके जमा या भ्रदा किये जाने का संभावना है, पांच सौ रुपये से अधिक नहीं हो।

2. इस अधिसूचना में निहित कोई बात ऐसे मामले पर लागू नहीं होगी जहाँ डिबेंचरों में होने वाली कुल आय और वेतन से होने वाली आय न्यूनतम कर-योग्य से सीमा से अधिक हो जाती है।

[क्रा०सं० 275/80/79-आयकर-बजट]

एम० आर० अग्रवाल, उप सचिव

## MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

New Delhi, the 19th February, 1980

**S.O. 520.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (iib) of the proviso to section 193 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby specifies, for the purposes of the said clause, the debentures issued before the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette, and the debentures to be issued after such date, by the Thanthai Periyar Transport Corporation Limited, Villupuram as a part of the Workers' Participation Scheme of the Government of Tamil Nadu :

Provided that—

- such debentures are not guaranteed by any Government as to the repayment of the principal or payment of interest ;
- such debentures are issued only to individuals including two or more individuals jointly ;
- such debentures are issued subject to the condition that they cannot be transferred to any person other than those mentioned in clause (b) ;
- such debentures carry interest at a rate not exceeding twelve per cent per annum ; and
- the aggregate amount of such interest income, credited or paid, or likely to be credited or paid, during a financial year in respect of each employee or former employee, does not exceed five hundred rupees.

Nothing contained in this notification shall apply to a case where the income from debentures, together with the income from salary, exceeds the minimum taxable limit.

[F. No. 275/80/79-ITB]

S. R. WADHWA, Dy. Secy.

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

शुद्धि-पत्र

नई दिल्ली, 15 फरवरी, 1980

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

**क्रा० प्रा० 521.**—20 अक्टूबर, 1979 के भारत के राजपत्र के भाग II, खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (ii) के पृष्ठ 2880 पर प्रकाशित इस विभाग की अधिसूचना एस०प्रो० 3536 के अंग्रेजी संस्करण में सैलर्स क्रोम लैडर कम्पनी के बाद "लिमिटेड" शब्द जोड़ा जाए।

[संख्या 15(31)-बी०प्रो० III/79]

(Department of Economic Affairs)

CORRIGENDA

New Delhi, the 15th February, 1980

BANKING DIVISION

**S.O. 521.**—In the English version of this Department's Notification S. O. 3536 published at page 2880 of Part-II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India dated 20th October, 1979, add the word "Ltd." after the words M/s. Chrome Leather Co.

[No. 15(31)-B.O. III/79]

शुद्धि पत्र

नई दिल्ली, 19 फरवरी, 1980

**क्रा० प्रा० 522.**—दिनांक 15 दिसम्बर, 1979 के भारत के राजपत्र के भाग II खण्ड 3(ii) में पृष्ठ 3499 पर प्रकाशित इस विभाग की अधिसूचना एस०प्रो० 4001 के अंग्रेजी संस्करण में 'कोल्हापुर' के स्थान पर 'कोल्हापुर' पढ़ा जाए।

[सं० 15(37)-बी०प्रो० III/79]

एन० डी० बत्रा, अवर सचिव

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 19th February, 1980

**S.O. 522.**—In the English version of this Department's Notification S.O. 4001 published at page 3499 of Part-II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) of Gazette of India dated 15th December, 1979, for the word 'Kolhapuru', read 'Kolhapur'.

[No. 15(37)-B.O. III/79]

N. D. BATRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 21 फरवरी, 1980

**क्रा० प्रा० 523.**—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर एतद्वारा घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) के उपबंध, इस अधिसूचना के भारत के राजपत्र में प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 28 फरवरी, 1981 तक की अवधि के लिये महाबोर कोऑपरेटिव क्रेडिट बैंक लि०, बेल्गांव पर लागू नहीं होंगे।

[सं० 8(8)-80/ए०सी०]

New Delhi, the 21st February, 1980

**S.O. 523.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 11 of the said Act shall not apply to the Mahaveer Co-operative Credit Bank Ltd., Belgaum for a period from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette to 28 February, 1981.

[No. 8(8)|80-AC]

नई दिल्ली, 22 फरवरी, 1980

**क्रा० प्रा० 524.**—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर एतद्वारा घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) के उपबंध, इस अधिसूचना के भारत के राजपत्र में प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 जून, 1980 तक की अवधि के लिये येलामंचिल कोऑपरेटिव ग्रामन बैंक लिमिटेड, येलामंचिल पर लागू नहीं होंगे।

[सं० 8(11)/80-ए०सी०]

New Delhi, the 22nd February, 1980

**S.O. 524.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of sub-section (1) of Section 11 of the said Act shall not apply to the Yellamanchili Co-operative Urban Bank Ltd., Yellamanchili for a period from the date of publication of the Notification in the Official Gazette to 30 June, 1980.

[No. 8(11)|80-AC]

नई दिल्ली, 23 फरवरी, 1980

New Delhi, the 26th February, 1980

का०आ० 525.—कृषि पुनर्वित्त और विकास निगम अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 10) की धारा 20 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड क) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा कृषि पुनर्वित्त और विकास निगम द्वारा 10 वर्ष की परिपक्वता अवधि वाले 36 करोड़ रुपये (छत्तीस करोड़ रुपये) के 12 से 14 मार्च, 1980 की अवधि के दौरान 100 प्रतिशत की दर पर जारी किये जाने वाले बाण्डों पर व्याज की दर 6 1/2 (साढ़े छः) प्रतिशत वार्षिक की दर से निर्धारित करती है और निगम को उक्त राशि से 10 प्रतिशत तक अधिक प्राप्ति अंशदान रख लेने का अधिकार होगा।

[संख्या एक० 10(9)/80-ए०सी०]  
यशवन्त राज, अवर सचिव

S.O. 525.—In pursuance of clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 20 of the Agricultural Refinance and Development Corporation Act, 1963 (10 of 1963), the Central Government hereby fixes 6-1/2 per cent (six and half per cent) per annum as the rate of interest payable on the bonds of Rs. 36 crores (Rupees thirty six crores) only to be issued at Rs. 100 per cent during the period 12th to 14th March, 1980 with the right to retain subscription received upto 10 per cent in excess of the said amount, with a maturity period of 10 years by the Agricultural Refinance and Development Corporation.

[No. F. 10(9)/80-AC]

YASHWANT RAJ, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 26 फरवरी 1980

का०आ० 526.—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 2 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा श्री मुनीरखान को कानपुर क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक, कानपुर का अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है तथा 27 फरवरी, 1980 से प्रारम्भ होकर 26 फरवरी, 1983 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि की उस अवधि के रूप में निर्धारित करती है जिसके दौरान श्री मुनीरखान अध्यक्ष के रूप में कार्य करेंगे।

[सं० एक० 1-22/79-आर०आर०बी०]  
इन्द्रानी सेन, अवर सचिव

S.O. 526.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Munir Khan as the Chairman of the Kanpur Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Kanpur and specifies the period commencing on the 27th February, 1980 and ending with the 26th February, 1983 as the period for which the said Shri Munir Khan shall hold office as such Chairman.

[No. F. 1-22/79-RRB]

INDRANI SEN, Under Secy.

केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड

नई दिल्ली, 31 दिसम्बर, 1979

आयकर

का० आ० 527.—केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121-क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, और अधिसूचना सं० 2580 (फा० सं० 261/26/78-आई टी जे) तारीख 15-11-1978 का भाग: उपान्तरण करने हुए, निदेश देता है उक्त अधिसूचना से उद्भव अनुसूची में स्तंभ सं० 2 के सामने विम्बनिखित सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (निरीक्षण) रेंज को स्तंभ सं० 3 पर उप मद 9 के रूप में जोड़ा जावेगा।

9. "सं० आ० आ० आयुक्त (निरीक्षण), रेंज-7 (सहायक)" वगैरह।

यह अधिसूचना सोमवार 24-12-1979 से प्रभावी होगी।

[सं. 3116/फा० सं० 261/22/79-आई टी जे]

## CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

New Delhi, the 31st December, 1979

## INCOME-TAX

S.O. 527.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 121A of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and in partial modification of notification No. 2580 (F. No. 261/26/78-ITJ) dated 15-11-1978, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that the following IAC, Range shall be added at Column Number 3 as sub-item 9 against serial number 2 in the schedule appended to the said notification.

9. "I.A.C., Range-VII (Asstt.)" Bangalore.

This notification shall take effect from Monday the 24-12-1979.

[No. 316/F. No. 261/22/79-ITJ]

का०आ० 528.—केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121-क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, और बोर्ड की अधिसूचना सं० 2891 (261/4/79-आई टी जे) तारीख 16-4-79 को अधिकांश करने हुए, निदेश देता है कि नीचे अनुसूची के स्तंभ (1) में विनिर्दिष्ट भारसाधकों के आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) उसके स्तंभ (2) और स्तंभ (3) में तत्पक्षी प्रविष्टियों में विनिर्दिष्ट आयकर बाई, सफिलों, जिलों और रेंजों में आयकर या अतिकर या व्याज कर से निर्धारित एवं सभी व्यक्तियों की बायत जो आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 246 की उपधारा (2) के खण्ड (क) से (ज) में, कम्पनी (लाभ) अतिकर अधिनियम, 1964 (1964 का 7) की धारा II की उपधारा (1) में और व्याज कर अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 45) की धारा 15 की उपधारा (1) में वर्णित किसी आदेन से व्यथित हैं, और ऐसे व्यक्तियों या ऐसे वर्ग के व्यक्तियों की बायत जिनके बारे में बोर्ड ने आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 215 की उपधारा (2) के खण्ड (i) के उपबन्धों के अनुसार निदेश दिया है या भविष्य में निदेश दे, अपने कृत्यों का पालन करेंगे।

## अनुसूची

भारसाधन और मुख्यालय	आयकर बाई और सफिल	सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (निरीक्षण) के रेंज
1	2	3
आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), चण्डीगढ़।	1. आयकर आयुक्त, हरियाणा की अधिकारिता के अन्तर्गत आने वाले सभी बाई/सफिल (केन्द्रीय सफिल को	1. आयकर आयुक्त, हरियाणा की अधिकारिता के अन्तर्गत आने वाले सभी रेंज।

1	2	3
	छोड़कर) जिसके अंतर्गत सम्पदा शुल्क सकल भी हैं।	2. सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), रोहतक।
2. आयकर आयुक्त, पटियाला की अधिकारिता के अन्तर्गत आने वाले, चण्डीगढ़, शिमला, सोलन पालमपुर, मंडी, रोपड़ और पटियाला स्थित सभी वार्ड/सर्किल (केन्द्रीय सकल को छोड़कर) जिनके अंतर्गत चण्डीगढ़ और पटियाला स्थित सम्पदा शुल्क सकल भी हैं।		3. आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) चण्डीगढ़ रेंज, चण्डीगढ़। 4. आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) पटियाला रेंज, पटियाला। 5. सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), चण्डीगढ़।

यह अधिसूचना तारीख 10-1-1980 से प्रभावी होगी।

जहाँ कोई आयकर, सकल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग इस अधिसूचना द्वारा एक भारसाधन से किसी अन्य भारसाधन को अन्तर्गत हो जाता है, वहाँ उस आयकर, सकल, वार्ड या जिले या उसके भाग में किए गए निर्धारणों से उत्पन्न होने वाली और उस भारसाधन के, जिससे वह आयकर, सकल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग अन्तर्गत हुआ है, आयकर आयुक्त के समक्ष इस अधिसूचना की तारीख के ठीक पूर्व लंबित अपीलें उस तारीख से जिस तारीख को यह अधिसूचना प्रभावी होती है, उस भारसाधन के, जिसको उक्त सकल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग अन्तर्गत हुआ है, आयकर आयुक्त को अन्तर्गत की जाएगी और वे उन पर कार्यवाही करेंगे।

[सं० 3117(फा०सं० 261/4/79-आई०टी०जे०)]

**S.O. 528.**—In exercise of the power conferred by sub-section(1) of Section 121-A of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and in supersession of Board's notification No. 2819 (261/4/79-ITJ) dated 16-5-1979 the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that the Commissioners of Income-tax (Appeals) of the Charges specified in column (1) of the Schedule below shall perform their functions in respect of such persons assessed to Income-tax or Sur-tax or Interest-tax in the Income tax Wards, Circles, Districts and Ranges specified in the corresponding entries in column (2) and column (3) thereof as are aggrieved by any of the orders mentioned in clauses (a) to (h) of sub-section (2) of section 246 of the Income-tax Act 1961, in sub-section (1) of Section II of Companies (Profits) Sur-tax Act, 1964 (7 of 1964), and in sub-section (1) of Section 15 of the Interest Tax Act, 1974 (45 of 1974, and also in respect of such persons or classes of persons as the Board has directed or may direct in future in accordance with the provisions of clause (i) of sub-section (2) of Section 246 of the Income-tax Act 1961.

#### SCHEDULE

Charges with Headquarters	Income-tax wards and Circles	Ranges of Inspecting Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax
1	2	3
Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals), Chandigarh.	1. All Wards/Circles (excluding Central Circles) including E.D. Circles within the jurisdiction of Commissioner of Income-tax Haryana. 2. All Wards/Circles (excluding Central Circles) located at Chandigarh, Simla, Solan, Palampur, Mandi, Ropar and Patiala including E.D. Circles at Chandigarh & Patiala within the Jurisdiction of Commissioner of Income-tax Patiala.	1. All Ranges within the Jurisdiction of Commissioner of Income-tax, Haryana. 2. I.A.C. (Asstt.), Rohtak. 3. I.A.C. Chandigarh Range, Chandigarh. 4. I.A.C. Patiala, Range Patiala. 5. I.A.C. (Asstt.), Chandigarh.

This notification shall take effect from 10-1-1980.

Whereas an Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof stands transferred by this notification from one charge to another charge, appeals arising out of assessments made in that Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this notification before the Commissioner of Income-tax of the Charge from

whom the Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred shall from the date of this notification takes effect be transferred to and dealt with by the Income-tax Commissioner of the charge to whom the said circle, ward or district or part thereof is transferred.

[No. 3117 (F. No. 261/4/79-ITJ)]

का०आ० 529.—केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और बोर्ड की अधिसूचना सं० 2790 (261/11/79-आई०टी०जे०) तारीख 28-4-79 को अधिकांत करते हुए, निदेश देना है कि नीचे अनुसूची के स्तंभ (1) में विनिर्दिष्ट भारसाधनों के आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) उसके स्तंभ (2) और स्तंभ (3) में तत्संबंधी प्रविष्टियों में विनिर्दिष्ट आयकर वार्डों, सर्किलों, जिलों और रेंजों में आयकर या अतिकर या ब्याज कर से निर्धारित ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों की बाबत जो आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 246 की उपधारा (2) के खण्ड (क) से (ज) में, कम्पनी (लाभ) अतिकर अधिनियम, 1964 (1964 का 7) की धारा II की उपधारा (1) में और ब्याज कर अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 45) की धारा 15 की उपधारा (1) में वर्णित किसी प्रादेश से व्यक्त हैं, और ऐसे व्यक्तियों या ऐसे वर्ग के व्यक्तियों की बाबत जिसके बारे में बोर्ड ने आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 246 की उपधारा (2) के खण्ड (i) के उपबंधों के अनुसार निदेश दिया है या भविष्य में निदेश दे, अपने कृत्यों का पालन करेंगे।

अनुसूची		
भारसाधन और मुख्यालय	आयकर वार्ड और सर्किल	सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (निरीक्षण) के रेंज
1	2	3
आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), जलंधर	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>आयकर आयुक्त, पटियाला की अधिकारिता के अन्तर्गत आने वाले, लुधियाना, खन्ना, संगरूर, बरनाला और मलेरकोटला स्थित सभी वार्ड/सर्किल (केन्द्रीय सर्किलों को छोड़कर) जिनके अन्तर्गत लुधियाना स्थित सम्पदा शुल्क सर्किल भी है।</li> <li>आयकर आयुक्त, जलंधर के अन्तर्गत आने वाले सभी वार्ड/सर्किल (केन्द्रीय सर्किलों को छोड़कर) जिनके अन्तर्गत सम्पदा शुल्क सर्किल भी हैं।</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>लुधियाना रेंज I और II के आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), लुधियाना।</li> <li>आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) (निर्धारण), पटियाला।</li> <li>आयकर आयुक्त, जलंधर की अधिकारिता के अन्तर्गत आने वाले सभी रेंज।</li> </ol>

यह अधिसूचना तारीख 10-1-1980 से प्रभावी होगी।

जहाँ कोई आयकर सर्किल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग इस अधिसूचना द्वारा एक भारसाधन से किसी अन्य भारसाधन को अन्तर्गत हो जाता है, वहाँ उस आयकर सर्किल, वार्ड या जिले या उसके भाग में किए गए निर्धारणों से उत्पन्न होने वाली और उस भारसाधन के, जिससे यह आयकर सर्किल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग अन्तर्गत हुआ है, आयकर आयुक्त के समक्ष इस अधिसूचना की तारीख के ठीक पूर्व लंबित अपीलें उस तारीख से जिस तारीख को यह अधिसूचना प्रभावी होती है, उस रेंज के, जिसको उक्त सर्किल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग अन्तर्गत हुआ है, सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) को अन्तर्गत की जाएगी और उसके द्वारा उन पर कार्यवाही की जाएगी।

[सं० 3118 (फा०सं० 261/11/79-आई०टी०जे०)]

एस० के० भटनागर, अधर सचिव

**S.O. 529:**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section(1) of Section 121-A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and in supersession of notification No. 2790 (261/11/79-ITJ) dated 28-4-1979 the Central Board of Direct Taxes, hereby directs that the Commissioners of Income-tax (Appeals) of the Charges specified in column (1) of the Schedule below, shall perform their functions in respect of such persons assessed to Income-tax or Sur-tax or Interest-tax in the Income-tax Wards, Circles, Districts and Ranges specified in the corresponding entries in column (2) and column (3) thereof as are aggrieved by any of the orders mentioned in clauses (a) to (h) of sub-section (2) of section 246 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, in sub-section (1) of Section II of Companies (Profits) Sur Tax Act, 1964 (7 of 1964), and in sub-section (1) of Section 15 of the Interest Tax Act, 1974 (45 of 1974) and also in respect of such persons or classes of persons as the Board has directed or may direct in future in accordance with the provisions of clause (i) of sub-section (2) of Section 246 of the Income Tax Act, 1961.

#### SCHEDULE

Charges with Headquarters	Income-tax Wards and Circles	Ranges of Inspecting Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax
1	2	3
Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals), Jullundur.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All Wards/Circles (excluding Central Circles) located at Ludhiana, Khanna, Sangrur, Barnala &amp; Malerkotla including E.D. Circle located at Ludhiana within the jurisdiction of CIT., Patiala.</li> <li>All Wards/Circles (excluding Central Circles) including E.D. Circles within the jurisdiction of CIT., Jullundur.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I.A.Cs, Ludhiana Range-I &amp; II, Ludhiana.</li> <li>J.A.C. (Assessment), Patiala.</li> <li>All Ranges within the jurisdiction of Commissioner of Income-tax Jullundur.</li> </ol>

This notification shall take effect from 10-1-1980.

Whereas an Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof stands transferred by this notification from one charge to another charge, appeals arising out of assessments made in that Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this notification before the Commissioner of Income-tax of the Charge from whom the Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred shall from the date of this

notification takes effect be transferred to and dealt with by the Commissioner of Income-tax of the Charge to whom the said Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred.

[No. 3118 (F. No. 261/11/79-ITJ)]

S. K. BHATNAGAR, Under Secy.

आयकर आयुक्त कार्यालय, विदर्भ नागपुर

नागपुर 1 जनवरी, 1980

आयकर

का०आ० 530.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 123 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा तथा इस बारे में सभी अन्य शक्तियों से आयकर आयुक्त, विदर्भ, नागपुर को समर्थ करने के लिए जो शक्तियाँ प्रदान की गई हैं उनका प्रयोग करने हुए मैं, आयकर आयुक्त, विदर्भ, नागपुर इस आदेश से नीचे दिए अनुसार निरीक्षीय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त के नये विशेष (स्पेशल) रेंज का निर्माण करने के लिए निर्देश देता हूँ:—

पदनाम	मुख्यालय
1. निरीक्षीय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, स्पेशल रेंज, नागपुर	नागपुर

यह अधिसूचना दि० 1-1-1980 से प्रभावी होगी।

[का० सं० तक०/नि स आ/कार्याधिकार क्षेत्र/79-80]

ए० वी० रामन, आयकर आयुक्त

Office of the Commissioner of Income-tax, Vidarbha, Nagpur

Nagpur, the 1st January, 1980

#### INCOME-TAX

S. O. 530.—In exercise of the powers conferred on him by Sub-Section (1) of Section 123 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, I the Commissioner of Income-tax, Vidarbha, Nagpur hereby directs creation of a New Special Range of the Inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax as under:—

Designation	Headquarters
(1)	(2)
1. Inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, Special Range, Nagpur.	Nagpur

This Notification shall take effect from 1-1-1980.

[F. No. Tech./IACS/Juris/79-80]

A. V. RAMAN, Commissioner of Income-tax

#### वाणिज्य तथा नागरिक पूति मंत्रालय

(वाणिज्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 8 मार्च, 1980

का०आ० 531.—निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण तथा निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, मै० सुपरिटेण्डेंस सर्विलेन्स इन्स्पेक्टोरेट आफ इंडिया, नयी दिल्ली को खनिज तथा अयस्क के निरीक्षण के लिये एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिये अधिकरण के रूप में मान्यता देती है।

[सं० 5(7)/79-नि०नि० तथा नि०उ०]

#### MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND CIVIL SUPPLIES (Department of Commerce)

New Delhi, the 8th March, 1980

S.O. 531.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963) the Central Government hereby recognises for a period of one year M/s. Superintendence Surveillance Inspectorate of India, New Delhi as an agency for the inspection of Minerals and Ores.

[No. 5(7)/79-EI & EP]

#### CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 8th March, 1980.

S.O. 532.—In the order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce, Civil Supplies & Co-operation No. S.O. 19, dated the 1st January, 1980, published in the Gazette of India, Part II—Section 3, sub-section (ii) dated the 5th January, 1980 at page No. 10.

For C. B. Kukreti, Joint Secretary, Read C. B. Kukreti Joint Director.

[No. 3(94)/75-EI & EP]

नई दिल्ली, 8 मार्च, 1980

का०आ० 533.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण तथा निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, अवरक निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम\* 1969 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्:—

1. (1) इन नियमों का नाम अवरक (निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. अवरक का निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1969 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

“निरीक्षण फीस:—इन नियमों के अधीन अवरक के प्रत्येक परेक्षण के लिए निरीक्षण फीस, न्यूनतम बीस रुपये के अधीन रहते हुए, ऐसे प्रत्येक परेक्षण के एक० ए० एस० (घाट तक निःशुल्क) मूल्य के प्रत्येक एक सौ रुपये के लिए, 30 पैसे की दर से प्रभाविता की जाएगी।”

[सं० 6(27)/76-नि०नि० तथा नि०उ०]-बोख०-1]

सी० वी० कुकरेती, संयुक्त निदेशक

New Delhi, the 8th March, 1980

S.O. 533.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Export of Mica (Inspection) Rules,\* 1969:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Mica (Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Mica (Inspection) Rules, 1969 for rule 6, the following rule shall be substituted, namely:—

\* पाठ टिप्पणी: का०आ० 268 दिनांक 16-1-1979।

\*Footnote.—S.O. 268 dated 16-1-1979.



"Inspection fees—Subject to a minimum of rupees twenty for each consignment of mica, a fee of 30 paise per one hundred rupees of F.A.S. (Free along side) value of each such consignment shall be charged for inspection under these rules".

[No. 6(27)/76-EI&EP-Vol. I]

C. B. KUKRETI, Joint Director

(मागरिक पूति विभाग)

भारतीय मानक संस्था

नई दिल्ली, 1980-02-06

कां.प्र. 534.—समय-समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) विनियम, 1955 के विनियम 8 के उपविनियम (1) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि जिन 309 लाइसेंसों के व्योरे नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं, उनका सितम्बर, 1979 में नवीकरण किया गया है:

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	सी एम/एल संख्या	वर्ष	भारतीय मानक विनिर्दिष्ट की पद संख्या
(1)	(2)	से तक	(5)
1.	212	79-09-01	80-08-31 IS: 10 (भाग 4)--- 1976
2.	213	79-09-01	80-08-31 IS: 10 (भाग 2)--- 1976
3.	327	79-07-01	80-08-31 IS: 10 (भाग 2)--- 1976
4.	403	79-09-01	80-08-31 IS: 561---1972
5.	427	79-09-01	80-08-31 IS: 1675---1971
6.	429	79-09-01	80-08-31 IS: 562---1972
7.	444	79-09-01	80-08-31 IS: 226---1975
8.	445	79-09-01	80-08-31 IS: 961---1975
9.	446	79-09-01	80-08-31 IS: 513---1973
10.	447	79-09-01	80-08-31 IS: 1079---1973
11.	532	79-09-01	80-08-31 IS: 2062---1969
12.	555	79-07-16	80-07-15 IS: 398---1976
13.	611	79-07-01	80-06-30 IS: 561---1972
14.	620	79-08-16	80-08-15 IS: 1322---1965
15.	656	79-08-01	80-07-31 IS: 1785 (भाग 1 और 2)---1966
16.	672	79-09-01	80-08-31 IS: 1977---1975
17.	677	79-08-01	80-07-31 IS: 564---1975
18.	755	79-09-01	80-08-31 IS: 2404---1972
19.	766	79-09-01	80-08-31 IS: 1977---1975
20.	780	79-07-16	80-07-15 IS: 1703---1977
21.	1007	79-09-16	80-09-15 IS: 226---1975
22.	1008	79-09-16	80-09-15 IS: 1977---1975
23.	1112	79-08-16	80-08-15 IS: 1480---1970
24.	1127	79-09-01	80-08-31 IS: 398 (भाग 1 और 2)---1972
25.	1131	79-01-01	80-12-31 IS: 694---1977
26.	1169	79-09-01	80-08-31 IS: 565---1961
27.	1183	79-08-01	80-07-31 IS: 632---1972
28.	1190	79-09-01	80-08-31 IS: 562---1972
29.	1191	79-09-01	80-08-31 IS: 561---1972

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
30.	1218	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS: 1855---1961 और IS: 1856---1970
31.	1329	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS: 5444---1969 IS: 5445---1969 IS: 5446---1969 IS: 5447---1969
32.	1342	78-01-01	79-06-15	IS: 1221---1971
33.	1371	79-06-16	80-06-15	IS: 2553---1971
34.	1465	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS: 2567---1973
35.	1498	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS: 398---1961
36.	1500	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS: 1308---1974
37.	1514	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS: 1011---1968
38.	1525	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS: 1507---1966
39.	1575	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS: 10 (भाग 2)--- ---1976
40.	1663	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS: 996---1964
41.	1693	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS: 1307---1973
42.	1700	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS: 3284---1965
43.	1729	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS: 780---1969
44.	1784	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS: 278---1978
45.	1789	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS: 3470---1966
46.	1804	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS: 277---1969
47.	1848	79-06-01	80-05-31	IS: 398---1961
48.	1861	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS: 564---1975
49.	1875	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS: 1596---1970
50.	1892	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS: 564---1975
51.	1931	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS: 565---1975
52.	1950	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS: 1307---1973
53.	1967	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS: 2567---1973
54.	2014	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS: 565---1975
55.	2023	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS: 2548---1967
56.	2038	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS: 774---1971
57.	2142	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS: 21---1975
58.	2147	79-08-16	80-08-31	IS: 325---1961
59.	2158	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS: 561---1972
60.	2161	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS: 2865---1964
61.	2170	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS: 564---1975
62.	2192	78-01-01	79-06-15	IS: 220---1972
63.	2230	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS: 633---1975
64.	2237	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS: 1307---1973
65.	2307	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS: 2347---1974
66.	2383	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS: 4450---1967
67.	2384	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS: 4449---1976
68.	2386	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS: 323---1959
69.	2389	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS: 3830---1970
70.	2406	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS: 561---1972
71.	2411	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS: 3564---1975
72.	2434	79-05-01	80-04-30	IS: 4985---1968
73.	2501	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS: 3623---1978
74.	2581	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS: 561---1972
75.	2586	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS: 3224---1971
76.	2587	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS: 3224---1971
77.	2595	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS: 2682---1966
78.	2626	79-09-16	80-09-16	IS: 2266---1970
79.	2629	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS: 3811---1976

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
80.	2630	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 4100—1967	128.	3933	79-09-01	80-12-31	IS : 7122—1973
81.	2658	79-11-16	79-11-15	IS : 434 (भाग 1)--- 1964	129.	3934	79-09-01	80-12-31	IS : 7121—1973
82.	2702	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 1786—1966	130.	3938	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 635—1975
83.	2731	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 694 (भाग 1 और 2)---1964	131.	3944	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 563—1973
84.	2744	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 562—1978	132.	3956	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 633—1975
85.	2762	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 226—1975	133.	3961	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2567—1973
86.	2763	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 1977—1975	134.	3972	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1989—1973
87.	2765	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2509—1973	135.	3995	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 3470—1966
88.	2809	79-05-16	80-05-15	IS : 5852—1977	136.	4012	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2567—1973
89.	2818	79-06-01	80-05-31	IS : 1786—1966	137.	4123	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 5950—1971
90.	2829	78-12-16	79-12-15	IS : 265—1976	138.	4215	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 561—1972
91.	2830	78-12-16	79-12-15	IS : 266—1961	139.	4216	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 562—1972
92.	2842	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1165—1967	140.	4252	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 7122—1973
93.	2879	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 5287—1969	141.	4259	79-03-16	80-03-15	IS : 1695—1960
94.	2963	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2002—1962	142.	4260	78-03-16	80-03-15	IS : 2293—1974
95.	2975	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 694—1977	143.	4284	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 561—1972
96.	3005	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1601—1960	144.	4309	79-04-16	80-04-15	IS : 916—1975
97.	3108	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 5604—1970	145.	4316	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2567—1973
98.	3136	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1011—1968	146.	4341	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 3035 (भाग-1) —1965
99.	3160	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 916—1975					IS : 3035 (भाग-2) —1967
100.	3281	79-09-16	80-04-15	IS : 10 (भाग 4)--- 1976	147.	4344	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 3903—1966
101.	3295	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 427—1965	148.	4368	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 633—1975
102.	3318	79-06-01	80-05-31	IS : 781—1977	149.	4403	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 2682—1966
103.	3328	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 789—1971	150.	4421	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 633—1975
104.	3383	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2397—1972	151.	4424	79-06-16	80-06-30	IS : 1785 (भाग 1) —1966
105.	3418	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 398—1961	152.	4446	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 2888—1974
106.	3458	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 633—1975	153.	4464	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1507—1966
107.	3460	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 10 (भाग 2)--- 1976	154.	4474	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 1370—1965
108.	3463	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 1786—1966	155.	4505	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 7121—1973
109.	3464	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 226—1975	156.	4506	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 7122—1973
110.	3465	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 1977—1975	157.	4548	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 398 (भाग 1 और 2)---1976
111.	3497	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 3076—1968	158.	4561	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 565—1975
112.	3515	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 5410—1969	159.	4576	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 1891 (भाग 1) —1968
113.	3517	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 1879—1975	160.	4583	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 419—1967
114.	3556	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 398 (भाग 1 और 2)---1976	161.	4586	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 6914—1973
115.	3559	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 5430—1969	162.	4587	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 6915—1973
116.	3655	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 561—1972	163.	4590	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2548—1967
117.	3656	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 564—1975	164.	4601	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 3984—1967
118.	3657	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 3747—1966	165.	4607	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 633—1975
119.	3744	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2148—1968	166.	4611	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 325—1970
120.	3747	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2567—1973	167.	4617	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2312—1967
121.	3784	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 398 (भाग 2)--- 1976	168.	4622	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2864—1973
122.	3798	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 1307—1973	169.	4621	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 5279—1963
123.	3813	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 633—1975	170.	4633	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1634—1974
124.	3880	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 1370—1965	171.	4634	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1695—1974
125.	3921	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 633—1975	172.	4635	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1696—1974
126.	3929	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1307—1973	173.	4636	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1697—1974
127.	3931	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 694 (भाग 2)--- 1964	174.	4637	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1698—1974
					175.	4638	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2558—1974
					176.	4639	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2923—1974
					177.	4640	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2924—1974
					178.	4641	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 5346—1975

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
179.	4193	79-02-01	80-01-31	IS : 1694--1974	232.	5505	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1026--1966
180.	4646	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1989--1975	233.	5515	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 4323--1967
181.	4650	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 325--1970	234.	5524	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 4588--1975
182.	4657	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 561--1972	235.	5536	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1307--1973
183.	4658	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 562--1972	236.	5510	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 226--1975
184.	4670	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 633--1975	237.	5539	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2567--1973
185.	4671	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 633--1975	238.	5540	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 398 (भाग 1 और 2) --1976
186.	4681	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1601--1960	239.	5553	79-03-16	80-03-15	IS : 1696--1974
187.	4698	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848--1971	240.	5596	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 564--1975
188.	4702	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848--1971	241.	5991	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 325--1970
189.	4704	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848--1971	242.	6042	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2148--1968
190.	4712	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848--1971	243.	6045	79-05-01	80-04-30	IS : 1239 (भाग 1) --1973
191.	4714	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848--1971	244.	6105	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 691--1966
192.	4768	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1601--1960	245.	6181	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 934--1976
193.	4820	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1323--1967	246.	6185	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 4654--1974
194.	4832	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 398--1961	247.	6187	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 5346--1975
195.	5015	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 7122--1973	248.	6189	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 2682--1966
196.	5026	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 4322--1967	249.	6232	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 694 (भाग 2) --1964
197.	5070	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 4323--1967	250.	6239	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 1165--1975
198.	5168	79-05-16	80-05-15	IS : 8054--1976	251.	6288	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 368--1963
199.	5181	78-10-16	79-10-15	IS : 774--1971	252.	6291	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 1165--1975
200.	5198	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 4449--1967	253.	6292	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 5410--1969
201.	5199	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 4100--1967	254.	6331	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 4654--1974
202.	5200	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 4450--1967	255.	6346	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 398 (भाग 1 और 2) --1976
203.	5201	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 3811--1966	256.	6363	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 786--1966
204.	5321	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 633--1975	257.	6364	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 226--1975
205.	5323	78-11-16	79-11-15	IS : 2567--1973	258.	6365	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1977--1975
206.	5331	79-05-16	80-05-15	IS : 2906--1969	259.	6368	97-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 564--1975
207.	5354	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2509--1973	260.	6376	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 3854--1966
208.	5359	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 1601--1960	261.	6381	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 4588--1975
209.	5373	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 226--1975	262.	6390	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 780--1969
210.	5378	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1891 (भाग 1 और 2) --1962	263.	6405	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 8023--1976
211.	5383	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 1786--1966	264.	6419	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 5281--1969
212.	5417	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 335--1972	265.	6434	79-10-01	81-06-30	IS : 1239 (भाग 1) --1973
213.	5426	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 3811--1966	266.	6435	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 5430--1969
214.	5447	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 561--1972	267.	6437	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 3903--1975
215.	5455	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 561--1972	268.	6620	79-01-01	79-12-31	IS : 4998--1974
216.	5457	79-09-01	80-09-15	IS : 633--1975	269.	6681	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 3745--1966
217.	5459	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 419--1967	270.	6765	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 4174--1969
218.	5461	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2509--1973	271.	6813	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 371--1966
219.	5462	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 7538--1975	272.	6859	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 4174--1967
220.	5463	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 778--1971	273.	6958	79-04-16	70-04-15	IS : 5455--1969
221.	5470	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2567--1978	274.	6986	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 7652--1975
222.	5471	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1601--1960	275.	6998	79-05-16	80-05-15	IS : 933--1976
223.	5475	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 4323--1967	276.	7006	79-05-16	80-05-15	IS : 10 (भाग 2) --1976
224.	5476	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 3903--1975	277.	7021	79-06-01	80-05-31	IS : 2202 (भाग 1) --1973
225.	5477	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 8056--1976					IS : 2191 (भाग 1) --1973
226.	5483	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2567--1973					
227.	5485	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 633--1975					
228.	5486	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 561--1972					
229.	5492	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1601--1960					
230.	5499	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 7407--1974					
231.	5500	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 694--1964					

					SCHEDULE				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Sl. No.	CM/L No.	Valid From	To	Indian Standard Specification No.
278.	7044	79-06-16	80-06-15	IS : 10 (भाग 2) --1976					
279.	7062	79-06-16	80-06-15	IS 10 (भाग 4) --1976	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
280.	7068	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS 3084--1973	1.	212	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 10 (Part IV)—1976
281.	7072	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 427--1967	2.	213	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 10 (Part II)—1976
282.	7073	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS 133--1975	3.	327	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 10 (Part II)—1976
283.	7081	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS 916 --1975	4.	403	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 561--1972
284.	7119	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 2878--1976	5.	427	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1675 --1971
285.	7127	79-07-22	80-07-31	IS : 3196--1974	6.	429	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 562--1972
286.	7135	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 4654--1974	7.	444	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 226--1975
287.	7140	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 2074--1962	8.	445	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 961--1975
288.	7155	79-08-01	80-08-31	IS : 4964 (भाग 2) --1975	9.	446	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 513--1973
					10.	447	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1079--1973
289.	7160	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1856 --1970	11.	532	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2062--1969
290.	7165	79-09-01	81-05-31	IS : 5277--1969	12.	555	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 398--1976
291.	7169	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2266--1970	13.	611	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 561--1972
				IS : 2365--1963	14.	620	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 1322 --1965
				IS : 2581--1968	15.	656	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 1785 (Part I & II) 1966
292.	7172	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 789--1971	16.	672	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1977--1975
293.	7178	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2645--1975	17.	677	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 564--1975
294.	7181	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2259--1963	18.	755	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2404--1972
295.	7193	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2861--1964	19.	766	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1977 --1975
296.	7195	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2567--1978	20.	780	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 1703--1977
297.	7201	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1786--1966	21.	1007	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 226--1975
298.	7207	79-09-16	80-09-30	IS : 4323--1967	22.	1008	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1977--1975
299.	7210	79-09-16	80-11-15	IS : 7538--1975	23.	1112	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 1480--1970
300.	7218	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2580--1965	24.	1127	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 398 (Part I & II)-- 1972
301.	7221	70-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2653--1964	25.	1131	79-01-01	80-12-31	IS : 694--1977
302.	7222	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2653--1964	26.	1169	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 565--1961
303.	7223	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2653--1964	27.	1183	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 632--1972
304.	7224	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2653--1964	28.	1190	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 562--1972
305.	7225	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 5281--1969	29.	1191	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 561--1972
306.	7251	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 6048--1970	30.	1218	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1855--1961 & IS : 1856--1970
307.	7252	79-10-01	80-10-31	IS : 325--1970	31.	1329	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 5444--1969 IS : 5445--1969 IS : 5446--1969 IS : 5447--1969
308.	1255	79-10-01	79-09-30	IS : 8487--1977	32.	1342	78-01-01	79-06-15	IS : 1221--1971
309.	7276	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 10 (भाग 4) --1976	33.	1371	79-06-16	80-06-15	IS : 2553--1971
					34.	1465	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2567--1973
					35.	1498	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 393--1961
					36.	1500	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1308--1974
					37.	1514	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1011--1968
					38.	1525	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1507--1966
					39.	1575	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 10 (Part II)—1976
					40.	1663	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 996--1964
					41.	1693	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 1307--1973
					42.	1700	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 3284--1965
					43.	1729	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 780--1969
					44.	1784	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 278--1978
					45.	1789	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 3470--1966
					46.	1804	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 277--1969
					47.	1848	79-06-01	80-05-31	IS : 398--1961
					48.	1861	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 564--1975
					49.	1875	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1596--1970
					50.	1892	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 564--1975
					51.	1931	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 565--1975
					52.	1950	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1307--1973
					53.	1967	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2567--1973

[सं०सी०एम०डी०/13 : 12]

(Department of Civil Supplies)

INDIAN STANDARDS INSTITUTION

New Delhi, the 1980-02-06

**S.O. 534.**—In pursuance of sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 8 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby, notifies that 309 licences, particulars of which are given in the following Schedule, have been renewed during the month of September, 1979:

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
54.	2014	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 565—1975	117.	3656	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 564—1975
55.	2023	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 2548—1967	118.	3657	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 3747—1977
56.	2038	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 774—1971	119.	3744	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2148—1968
57.	2142	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 21—1975	120.	3747	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2567—1973
58.	2147	79-08-16	80-08-31	IS : 325—1961	121.	3784	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 398 (Part II)—1976
59.	2158	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 561—1972	122.	3798	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 1307—1973
60.	2161	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2865—1964	123.	3813	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 633—1975
61.	2170	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 564—1975	124.	3880	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 1370—1965
62.	2192	78-01-01	79-06-15	IS : 220—1972	125.	3921	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 633—1975
63.	2230	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 633—1975	126.	3929	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1307—1973
64.	2237	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1307—1973	127.	3931	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 694 (Part II)—1964
65.	2307	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2347—1974	128.	3933	79-09-01	80-12-31	IS : 7112—1973
66.	2383	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 4450—1967	129.	3934	79-09-01	80-12-31	IS : 7121—1973
67.	2384	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 4449—1976	130.	3938	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 633—1975
68.	2386	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 323—1959	131.	3944	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 563—1973
69.	2389	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 3830—1970	132.	3956	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 633—1975
70.	2406	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 561—1972	133.	3961	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2567—1973
71.	2411	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 3564—1975	134.	3972	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1989—1973
72.	2434	79-05-01	80-04-30	IS : 4985—1968	135.	3995	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 3470—1966
73.	2501	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 3623—1978	136.	4012	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2567—1973
74.	2581	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 561—1972	137.	4123	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 5950—1971
75.	2586	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 3224—1971	138.	4215	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 561—1972
76.	2587	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 3224—1971	139.	4216	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 562—1972
77.	2595	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2682—1966	140.	4252	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 7122—1973
78.	2626	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2266—1970	141.	4259	79-03-16	80-03-15	IS : 1695—1960
79.	2629	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 3811—1976	142.	4269	79-03-16	80-03-15	IS : 2293—1974
80.	2630	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 4160—1967	143.	4284	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 561—1972
81.	2658	78-11-16	79-11-15	IS : 434 (Part I)—1964	144.	4309	79-04-16	80-04-15	IS : 916—1975
82.	2702	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 1786—1966	145.	4316	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2567—1973
83.	2731	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 694 (Part I & II)—1964	146.	4341	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 3035 (Part I)—1965 IS : 3035 (Part II)—1967
84.	2744	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 562—1978	147.	4344	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 3903—1966
85.	2762	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 226—1975	148.	4368	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 633—1975
86.	2763	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 1977—1975	149.	4403	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 2682—1966
87.	2765	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2509—1973	150.	4421	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 633—1975
88.	2809	79-05-16	80-05-15	IS : 5852—1977	151.	4424	79-06-16	80-06-30	IS : 1785 (Part I)—1966
89.	2818	79-06-01	80-05-31	IS : 1786—1966	152.	4446	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 2888—1974
90.	2829	78-12-16	79-12-15	IS : 265—1976	153.	4464	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1507—1966
91.	2830	78-12-16	79-12-15	IS : 266—1961	154.	4474	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 1370—1965
92.	2842	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1165—1967	155.	4505	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 7121—1973
93.	2879	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 5287—1969	156.	4506	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 7122—1973
94.	2963	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2002—1962	157.	4528	79-03-16	80-08-15	IS : 398 (Part I & II)—1976
95.	2975	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 694—1977	158.	4561	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 565—1975
96.	3005	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1601—1960	159.	4576	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 1891—(Part I)—1968
97.	3108	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 5604—1970	160.	4583	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 419—1967
98.	3136	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1011—1968	161.	4586	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 6914—1973
99.	3160	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 916—1975	162.	4587	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 6915—1973
100.	3281	79-09-16	80-04-15	IS : 10 (Part IV)—1976	163.	4590	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2548—1967
101.	3295	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 427—1965	164.	4601	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 3984—1967
102.	3318	79-06-01	80-05-31	IS : 781—1977	165.	4607	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 633—1975
103.	3328	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 789—1971	166.	4611	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 325—1970
104.	3383	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2397—1972	167.	4617	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2312—1967
105.	3418	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 398—1961	168.	4622	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2864—1973
106.	3458	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 633—1975	169.	4624	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 5279—1963
107.	3460	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 10 (Part II)—1976	170.	4633	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1694—1974
108.	3463	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 1786—1966	171.	4634	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1695—1974
109.	3464	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 226—1975	172.	4635	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1696—1974
110.	3465	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 1977—1975	173.	4636	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1697—1974
111.	3497	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 3076—1968	174.	4637	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1698—1974
112.	3515	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 5410—1969	175.	4638	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2558—1974
113.	3517	79-08-16	80-08-16	IS : 1879—1975	176.	4639	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2923—1974
114.	3556	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 398 (Part I & II)—1976	177.	4640	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2924—1974
115.	3559	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 5430—1969	178.	4641	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 5346—1975
116.	3655	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 561—1972	179.	4193	79-02-01	80-01-31	IS : 1694—1974
					180.	4646	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1989—1975

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
181.	4650	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 325—1970	245.	6181	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 934—1976
182.	4657	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 561—1972	246.	6185	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 4654—1974
183.	4658	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 562—1972	247.	6187	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 5346—1975
184.	4670	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 633—1975	248.	6189	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 2682—1966
185.	4671	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 398—1976	249.	6232	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 694 (Part II)—1964
186.	4684	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1601—1960	250.	6239	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 1165—1975
187.	4698	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848—1971	251.	6288	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 368—1963
188.	4702	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848—1971	252.	6291	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 1165—1975
189.	4704	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848—1971	253.	6292	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 5410—1969
190.	4712	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848—1971	254.	6331	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 4654—1974
191.	4714	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848—1971	255.	6346	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 398 (Part I & II) — 1976
192.	4768	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1601—1960	256.	6363	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1786—1966
193.	4820	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 4323—1967	257.	6364	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 226—1975
194.	4832	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 398—1961	258.	6365	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1977—1975
195.	5015	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 7122—1973	259.	6368	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 564—1975
196.	5026	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 4322—1967	260.	6376	70-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 3854—1966
197.	5070	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 4323—1967	261.	6381	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 4588—1975
198.	5168	79-05-16	80-05-15	IS : 8054—1976	262.	6390	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 780—1969
199.	5181	79-10-16	79-10-15	IS : 774—1971	263.	6405	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 8028—1976
200.	5198	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 4449—1967	264.	6419	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 5281—1969
201.	5199	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 4100—1967	265.	6434	79-10-01	81-06-30	IS : 1239 (Part I)—1973
202.	5200	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 4450—1967	266.	6435	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 5430—1969
203.	5201	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 3811—1966	267.	6437	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 3903—1975
204.	5321	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 633—1975	268.	6620	79-01-01	79-12-31	IS : 4998—1974
205.	5323	78-11-16	79-11-15	IS : 2567—1973	269.	6681	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 3745—1966
206.	5331	79-05-16	80-05-15	IS : 2906—1969	270.	6765	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 4174—1969
207.	5354	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2509—1973	271.	6813	79-09-01	80-03-31	IS : 371—1966
208.	5359	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 1601—1960	272.	6859	79-03-16	80-08-15	IS : 4174—1967
209.	5373	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 226—1975	273.	6958	79-04-16	80-04-15	IS : 5455—1969
210.	5378	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1891 (Part I & II) — 1962	274.	6986	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 7652—1975
211.	5383	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 1786—1966	275.	6998	79-05-16	80-05-15	IS : 933—1976
212.	5417	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 335—1972	276.	7006	79-05-16	80-05-15	IS : 10 (Part II)—1976
213.	5426	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 3811—1966	277.	7021	79-06-01	80-05-31	IS : 2202 (Part I) —1973
214.	5447	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 561—1972					IS : 2191 (Part I) —1973
215.	5455	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 561—1972	278.	7044	79-06-16	80-06-15	IS : 10 (Part II)—1976
216.	5457	79-09-01	80-09-15	IS : 633—1975	279.	7062	79-06-16	80-06-15	IS : 10 (Part IV)—1976
217.	5459	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 419—1967	280.	7068	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 3084—1975
218.	5461	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2509—1973	281.	7072	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 427—1967
219.	5462	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 7538—1975	282.	7073	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 133—1975
220.	5463	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 778—1971	283.	7081	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 916—1975
221.	5470	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2567—1978	284.	7119	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 2878—1976
222.	5471	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1601—1960	285.	7127	79-07-22	80-07-31	IS : 3196—1974
223.	5475	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 4323—1967	286.	7135	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 4654—1974
224.	5476	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 3903—1975	287.	7140	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 2074—1962
225.	5477	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 8056—1976	288.	7155	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 4964 (Part II)—1975
226.	5483	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2567—1973	289.	7160	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1856—1970
227.	5485	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 633—1975	290.	7165	79-09-01	81-05-31	IS : 5277—1969
228.	5486	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 561—1972	291.	7169	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2266—1970
229.	5492	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1601—1960					IS : 2365—1963
230.	5499	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 7407—1974	292.	7172	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2581—1968
231.	5500	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 694—1964	293.	7178	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 789—1971
232.	5505	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1026—1966	294.	7181	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2645—1975
233.	5515	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 4323—1967	295.	7193	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2259—1963
234.	5524	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 4588—1975	296.	7195	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2861—1964
235.	5536	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1307—1973	297.	7201	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2567—1978
236.	5510	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 226—1975	298.	7207	79-09-16	80-09-30	IS : 1786—1966
237.	5539	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2567—1973	299.	7210	79-09-16	80-11-15	IS : 4323—1967
238.	5540	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 398 (Part I & II)—1976	300.	7218	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 7538—1975
239.	5553	79-03-16	80-03-15	IS : 1696—1974	301.	7221	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2580—1965
240.	5596	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 564—1975	302.	7222	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2653—1964
241.	5991	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 325—1970	303.	7223	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2653—1964
242.	6042	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2148—1968	304.	7224	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2653—1964
243.	6045	79-05-01	80-04-30	IS : 1239 (Part I)—1973	305.	7225	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 5281—1969
244.	6105	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 691—1966	306.	7251	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 6048—1970
					307.	7252	79-10-01	80-10-31	IS : 325—1970
					308.	7255	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 8487—1977
					309.	7276	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 10 (Part IV)—1976

नई दिल्ली, 19 फरवरी 1980

का० आ० 535.—समय समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन विज्ञान) के विनियम 1955 के विनियम 14 के उपविनियम (4) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था की ओर से अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि लाइसेंस संख्या सी०एम०/एल०-6189 जिसके व्यौरे नीचे अनुसूची में दिये गये हैं लाइसेंस धारी द्वारा लाइसेंस समर्पित कर देने के कारण दिनांक 16 नवम्बर, 1979 से रद्द कर दिया गया है।

## अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस संख्या और दिनांक	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	रद्द किए गए लाइसेंस के अधीन वस्तु/प्रक्रिया	सम्बन्धित मानक
(1)	(2)	(3)	(3)	(4)
1.	सी०एम०/एल०-6189 1977-06-22	मेसर्स प्लांटक्यूर कान्सेन्ट्रेट्स पो० बा० सं० 134 हिम्मत नगर, सहारनपुर-247001	क्लोर्डेन् पायसमीय सान्द्र	IS : 2682-1966 क्लोरडेन् पायस-नीय सान्द्र की विशिष्टि

[सी० एम०एल०/55 : 6189]

ए० पी० बनर्जी, अपरसहानिवेशक

New Delhi, the 1980-02-19

S.O. 535.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (4) of regulation 14 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks), Regulations 1955 as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that Licence No. CM/L—6189 particulars of which are given in the Schedule below has been cancelled with effect from Sixteenth September, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Seventy-nine as the party has surrendered the licence.

## SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. and Date	Name & Address of the Licensee	Article/Process Covered by the Licence Cancelled	Relevant Indian Standards
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	CM/L—6189 1977 06-22	M/s Planteure Concentrates, Post Box No. 134, Himmat Nagar, Saharanpur-247001.	Chlordane Emulsifiable Concentrates.	IS : 2682—1966 Specification for Chlordane Emulsifiable Concentrates.

[CMD/55 : 6189]

A. P. BANERJI, Additional Director General,  
ISI

(मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

## आवेश

नई दिल्ली, 22 फरवरी, 1980

का० आ० 536.—स्टोर नियंत्रक, पश्चिमी रेलवे, नून गेट, बम्बई को यू० के० भारत अनुस्था अनुदान 1977 के अन्तर्गत, अप्रैल 78-मार्च 79 की लाइसेंस अवधि के लिये गुनिट पैकेज आदि आयात करने के लिये 76,225/- रुपये (छहत्तर हजार दो सौ पचीस रुपये मात्र) का आयात लाइसेंस सं० जी०आर/3200980/आर/एम जी/70/एच/78 दिनांक 24-1-79 प्रदान किया गया था जो 31-12-79 तक वैध था। प्रस्य लाइसेंसधारी ने उक्त लाइसेंस की मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण की अनुलिपि प्रति जारी करने के लिये इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति, स्टेट बैंक इंडिया, बम्बई में साख पत्र खोलने के पश्चात् 12-6-79 को वित्तीय सलाहकार एवं मुख्य लेखा अधिकारी, पश्चिमी, रेलवे, चर्च गेट, बम्बई को भेजते समय पारगमन में खो गई/अस्थायी हो गई है।

अपने तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने स्टाम्प कागज पर एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। अधीहस्ताक्षरी इस बात से संतुष्ट है कि आयात लाइसेंस जी०आर/3200980/आर/एम जी/70/एच/78 दिनांक 24-1-79 की मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई/अस्थायी हो गई है और निवेश वेता है कि उक्त लाइसेंस की मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि प्रति पूरे मूल्य अर्थात् 76,225/- रुपये के लिए जारी की जानी चाहिए। आयात लाइसेंस जी०आर/3200980/आर/एम जी/70/एच/78 दिनांक 24-1-79 की मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति एन्ड द्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

[सं० सी/रेलवे/78-79/जी एन एस]

सी० एस० आर्य, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक,

आयात-निर्यात,

कृते मुख्य नियंत्रक।

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF CONTROLLER OF  
IMPORTS & EXPORTS  
ORDER

New Delhi, the 22nd February, 1980

**S.O. 536.**—The Controller of Stores, Western Railway, Church Gate, Bombay was granted an import licence No. G/R/3200980/R/MG/70/H/78 dated 24-1-1979 valid upto 31-12-1979 for import of unit packages etc. for the licensing period April 78—March 79 for the value Rs. 76,225 only (Rupees seventy six thousand two hundred and twenty five only) under U. K.—India Maintenance Grant 1977. Now the licensee has requested this office for the issue of duplicate Exchange Control Purpose copy of the said licence on the ground that the original Exchange Control Purpose copy of the said licence has been lost/misplaced in transit while forwarding the same on 12-6-1979 to the Financial Adviser and Chief Accounts Officer, Western Railway Church Gate, Bombay after opening Letter of Credit by the State Bank of India, Bombay.

2. In support of their contention, the applicant has filed an affidavit on stamped paper. The undersigned is satisfied that the original Exchange Control Purpose copy of licence No. G/P.3200980/R/MG/70/H/78 dated 24-1-1979 has been lost/misplaced by the applicant and directs that duplicate Exchange Control Purpose copy of the said licence for full value of Rs. 76,225 only should be issued to him. The original Exchange Control Purpose copy of the import licence No. G/R/3200980/R/MG/70/H/78 dated 24-1-79 is hereby cancelled.

[No. 235/C/Rly.78-79/GLS/553]

C. S. ARYA, Dy. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports  
for Chief Controller

नई दिल्ली, 26 फरवरी, 1980

**क्र० आ० 537.**—सर्वश्री प्रिंटेर्स इंजीनियरिंग कम्पनी लिमिटेड बम्बई का भारत-चेकोस्लोवाकिया व्यापार योजना अनुमति 1977 के अंतर्गत पंजीकृत साल के आयात के लिए 2,45,745 रुपए (दो लाख पैंतालीस हजार, सात सौ पैंतालीस रुपये मात्र) का एक आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/सीजी/2072885/टी/सी आर/66/एच/77/सी जी III दिनांक 12-1-78 प्रदान किया गया था। फर्म ने उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की अनुमति सीमा-शुल्क और मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रतियां जारी करने के लिए इस आदेश पर आवेदन किया है कि लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा-शुल्क प्रति और मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति खो गई अथवा अस्थायित्व हो गई है। आरो यह बताया गया है कि लाइसेंस की सीमा शुल्क और मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण, प्रयोजन प्रतियां बम्बई के सीमा-शुल्क प्राधिकारी के पास पंजीकृत कराई गई थी और सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति का 35,615 रुपये तक उपयोग हो चुका है।

2. अपने तर्कों के समर्थन में, लाइसेंसधारी ने दिल्ली नगर के नोटरी पब्लिक के सामुख्य विधिबन्ध शस्त्र लेकर स्टाम्प कागज पर एक शपथ-पत्र दाखिल किया है। तदनुसार मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/सीजी/2072885 दिनांक 12-1-78 की मूल सीमा-शुल्क और मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रतियां फर्म ने खो गई अथवा अस्थायित्व हो गई हैं। यथासंशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-55 की उपधारा 9(सी सी) के अंतर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए सर्वश्री प्रिंटेर्स इंजीनियरिंग कम्पनी लि०, बम्बई को जारी किए गए आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/सीजी/2072885 दिनांक 12-1-78 की उक्त मूल सीमा-शुल्क और मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रतियां एन्ड द्वारा रद्द की जाती हैं।

3. पार्टी को उक्त लाइसेंस की अनुमति सीमा-शुल्क और मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रतियां अलग से जारी की जा रही हैं।

[सं० 1278/77/8/सी जी 3]

जी०एंग० ब्रेवाल, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात

New Delhi, the 26th February, 1980

**S.O. 537.**—M/s. Printers Engineering Company Limited Bombay were granted an import licence No. P/CG/2072885/T/CR/66/H/77/CG. III dated 12-1-78 for Rs. 2,45,745/- (Rupees Two lakhs forty five thousand seven hundred and forty five only) for import of Capital Goods under Indo-Czechoslovakia Trade Plan Provision, 1977. The firm has applied for issue of Duplicate copies of (Customs and Ex-Control purposes copies) of the above mentioned licence on the ground that the original Customs and Ex-control purposes copies of the licence have been lost or misplaced. It has further been stated that the Customs and Ex. control purposes copies of the licence was registered with Bombay Customs authority and as such that value of Customs purpose copies has been utilised to the extent of Rs. 35,615/-.

8. In support of their contention, the licensee has filed in affidavit on stamped paper duly sworn in before a Notary Public in the U. T. Delhi. I am accordingly satisfied that the original Customs and Ex-control purposes copies of import licence No. P/CG/2072885 dated 12-1-78 have been lost or misplaced by the firm. In exercise of the powers conferred under sub-clause 9(cc) of the Import (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended the said original Customs and Ex-control purposes copies of Import Licence No. P/CG/2072885 dated 12-1-78 issued to M/s. Printers Engineering Company Ltd., Bombay are hereby cancelled.

3. A duplicate Customs and Ex-control purposes copies of the said licence is being issued to the party separately.

[F. No. CGIII/1278/77/8]

G. S. GREWAL,

Dy. Chief Controller of Import and Export

उद्योग मंत्रालय

(औद्योगिक विकास विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 21 फरवरी, 1980

**क्र० आ० 538.**—केन्द्रीय रेशन बोर्ड अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 61) की धारा 4(3)(ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा हथकरघा के विकास आयुक्त श्री शिरोमणि शर्मा को केन्द्रीय रेशन बोर्ड का सदस्य और श्री आर० श्रीनिवासन के स्थान पर बोर्ड का उपाध्यक्ष नामित करती है तथा उद्योग मंत्रालय, औद्योगिक विकास विभाग में भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना सा० आ० सं० 743(ड) दिनांक 20 नवम्बर, 1979 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

- हथकरघा विकास आयुक्त,  
औद्योगिक विकास विभाग, उपाध्यक्ष  
उद्योग मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली।
- श्री आर० एन० सोनी,  
निदेशक के स्थान पर  
श्री एम० कृष्णमूर्ति,  
उप-सचिव।
- श्री ए० के० ए० समद,  
द्वारा करीमसंस प्राइवेट लिमिटेड,  
पी० आ० रामनगरम (कर्नाटक)।
- रेशन नियंत्रक,  
तमिलनाडु सरकार,  
सं० 21, रानी विद्याम,  
फेयरहैट, सेलम-4
- हथकरघा तथा रेशम,  
निदेशक,  
बिहार सरकार,  
पटना।
- डा० एम० आर० राजेश्वर शेट्टी,  
प्रोफेसर, जीव विज्ञान, मानस जंठु,  
मैसूर विश्वविद्यालय, कर्नाटक।

[क्र० सं० 25012/19/78-सिक्क]

एस० वेणुगोपालन, निदेशक



**MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY**

(Department of Industrial Development)

New Delhi, the 21st February, 1980

S. O. 538.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 4(3) (b) of the Central Silk Board Act, 1948 (61 of 1948), the Central Government hereby nominates Shri Shiroman Sharma, Development Commissioner for Handlooms as a Member of the Central Silk Board and also to serve as its Vice-Chairman vice Shri R. Srinivasan, and makes the following amendments in the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Industry, Department of Industrial Development, published vide S.O. No. 743(E), dated the 20th November, 1979, namely—

1. Development Commissioner for Hand- Vice-Chairman, Department of Industrial Development, New Delhi
3. Shri S. Krishnamoorthy, Deputy Secretary,  
Vice  
Shri R.N. Soni,  
Director
7. Shri A.K.A. Samad,  
C/o Karjem Sons Pvt. Ltd.,  
P.O. Ramanagaram (Karnataka).
9. Director of Sericulture,  
Government of Tamil Nadu,  
No. 21, Rani Nivas,  
Falirland, Salem-4.
13. Director of Handloom & Sericulture,  
Government of Bihar, Patna.
27. Dr. M.R. Rajasekarasetty,  
Professor of Zoology in Manasazantu,  
University of Mysore, Karnataka.

[File No. 25012/19/78-Silk]

S. VENUGOPALAN, Director

**ऊजा और सिंचाई मंत्रालय**

(सिंचाई विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 22 फरवरी, 1980

क्रा० प्रा० 539.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय नदी, नर्मदा, और उसकी नदी घाटी की बाबत जल विवाद के अधिनियम के लिये अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय जल विवाद अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 33) की धारा 4 के अधीन भारत सरकार के सिंचाई और विद्युत मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० क्रा० प्रा० 4055, तारीख 6 अक्टूबर, 1969 द्वारा नर्मदा जल विवाद अधिकरण का गठन किया था ;

और उक्त अधिकरण ने उसे निर्देशित विषयों के संबंध में अन्वेषण करके अपनी एक रिपोर्ट, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 5 की उपधारा (2) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को अर्पित की है जिसमें उसके द्वारा पाए गए तथ्यों और निर्देशित विषयों पर उगका विनिश्चय समाविष्ट है;

और उक्त विनिश्चय पर विचार करके, केन्द्रीय सरकार तथा गुजरात, मध्य प्रदेश, महाराष्ट्र और राजस्थान की सरकारों ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 5 की उपधारा (3) के अधीन उक्त अधिकरण को कुछ विषय निर्देशित किए थे और इस प्रकार निर्देशित विषयों पर अधिकरण ने केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त उपधारा के अधीन एक और रिपोर्ट अर्पित की है जिसमें ऐसे स्पष्टीकरण और मार्गदर्शन दिए गए हैं जो उसने ठीक समझे हैं ;

1219 GI/79—4

और उक्त अधिकरण की ऊपर रिपोर्ट में दिए गए स्पष्टीकरणों और मार्गदर्शन द्वारा यथा उपान्वित, अधिकरण के विनिश्चय को केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की अपेक्षानुसार, भारत सरकार के कृषि और सिंचाई मंत्रालय, (सिंचाई विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० क्रा० प्रा० 792(प्र), तारीख 12 दिसम्बर, 1979 द्वारा प्रकाशित कर दिया था ;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, 29 फरवरी, 1980 के अपराह्न से उक्त अधिकरण को विघटित करती है ।

[सं० 4/4/79—इस्यू० डी०]

च० छो० पटेल, सचिव (सिंचाई)

**MINISTRY OF ENERGY AND IRRIGATION**

(Department of Irrigation)

New Delhi, the 22nd February, 1980

S.O. 539.—Whereas the Central Government had constituted by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Irrigation and Power No. S.O. 4054, dated the 6th October, 1969, issued under section 4 of the Inter-State Water Disputes Act, 1956 (33 of 1956), the Narmada Water Disputes Tribunal to adjudicate upon the water dispute regarding the inter-State river, Narmada, and the river valley thereof ;

And whereas, the said Tribunal investigated the matters referred to it and informed to the Central Government under sub-section (2) of section 5 of the said Act, a report setting out the facts as found by it and giving its decision on the matters referred to it ;

And whereas, upon consideration of the said decision, the Central Government and the Governments of the States of Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Rajasthan made references to the said Tribunal under sub-section (3) of section 5 of the said Act and the Tribunal, on such references, forwarded to the Central Government, under that sub-section a further report giving such explanations and guidance as it deemed fit ;

And whereas the decision of the said Tribunal as modified by the explanation and guidance given in its further report was published by the Central Government as required by section 6 of the said Act, vide notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (Department of Irrigation) No. S.O. 792(E), dated the 12th December, 1979 ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 12 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby dissolves the said Tribunal with effect from the afternoon of the twentieth day of February, 1980.

[No. 4/4/79-WD]

C. C. PATEL, Secy. (Irrigation)

**स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय**

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 1980

क्रा० प्रा० 540.—केन्द्रीय योग प्रसंघान संस्थान और विश्वायतन य गाथ्रम के प्रशासक, स्वामी भगवत्जी के त्याग-पत्र की स्वीकृति के परिणामस्वरूप उन्होंने 18-2-1980 (पूर्वाह्न) से अपने पद का कार्यभार त्याग दिया है ।

[सं० प्रार० 11013/35/79—प्रायु० डेस्क-III]

मुन्दर कुमार कर्मा, उप सचिव

## MINISTRY OF HEALTH &amp; FAMILY WELFARE

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 18th February, 1980

S.O. 540.—Consequent on the acceptance of his resignation, Swami Manuvarayaji, Administrator, Central Research Institute for Yoga and Vishwayatan Yogashram has relinquished the charge of the post with effect from 18-2-1980 (forenoon).

[No. R. 11015/35/79-Ay. Desk III]

S. K. KARTHAK, Dy. Secy.

बन्धोपाध्याय को 1 फरवरी, 1980 के पूर्वह्न से सहायक भुगतान प्रायुक्त नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० 11024/2/80-सी०ए०]

टी० सी० ए० श्रीनिवास्तन, उप सचिव

## MINISTRY OF STEEL, MINES AND COAL

(Department of Coal)

New Delhi, the 18th February, 1980

S.O. 541.—In exercise of the powers conferred under Sub-section (2) of the Section 20 of the Coking Coal Mines (Nationalisation) Act, 1972 (36 of 1972), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Gurudas Bandyopadhyay as Asstt. Commissioner of Payments w.e.f. the forenoon of the 1st February, 1980.

[No. 11024/2/80-CA]

T. C. A. SRINIVASAN, Dy. Secy.

## इस्पात, खान और कोयला मंत्रालय

(कोयला विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 1980

का०आ० 541.—कोकर कोयला खान (राष्ट्रीयकरण) अधिनियम, 1972 (1972 का 36) की धारा 20 की उपधारा (2) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री गुरुदास

नई दिल्ली, 21 फरवरी, 1980

का०आ० 542.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व ऊर्जा मंत्रालय (कोयला विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का०आ० 840, तारीख 25 मार्च, 1978 द्वारा, कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (घर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन इससे संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट परिच्छेद की स्थल 270.00 एकड़ (लगभग) या 109.26 हेक्टर (लगभग) भूमि में कोयले के पूर्वक्षण के अपने आशय की सूचना की थी;

और उक्त भूमि की बाबत, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन कोई सूचना नहीं दी गई है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, 25 मार्च, 1980 से प्रारंभ होने वाली एक वर्ष की प्रतिरिक्त अवधि को ऐसी अवधि के रूप में विनिर्दिष्ट करती है जिसके भीतर केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त भूमि को या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर किन्हीं अधिकारों के अर्जित करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दे सकती है।

## अनुसूची

पिंड-वतमा बिस्तार ब्लॉक  
(पश्चिमी बोकारो कोयला क्षेत्र)

आ० सं० राज०/62/77

तारीख 5-11-1977

(जिसमें पूर्वक्षण के लिए अधिसूचित भूमि दर्शित की गई है)

क्र०सं०	ग्राम	धाना	धाना सं०	जिला	क्षेत्र	टिप्पण
1	राबोध	मांडू	51	हजारीबाग	भाग	
			कुलक्षेत्र	270.00 एकड़	(लगभग)	
			या	109.26 हेक्टर	(लगभग)	

सीमा वर्णन :

क-ख रेखा ग्राम राबोध से होकर जाती है।

ख-ग रेखा ग्राम राबोध से होकर जाती है।

ग-घ रेखा राबोध और वतमा ग्रामों की भागतः सम्मिलित सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है (जो वतमा कोयला खान की भागतः सामान्य सीमा भी है)

घ-ङ रेखा पिंड और राबोध की भागतः सम्मिलित सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है (जो पिंड कोयला खान की भागतः सम्मिलित सीमा भी है) और प्रारंभिक बिन्दु 'क' पर मिल जाती है।

[सं० 19(1)/80-सी०एस०]

New Delhi, the 21st February, 1980.

**S.O.542:—** Whereas by the Notification of the Government of India in the late ministry of Energy (Department of Coal) No. S.O. 840 dated 25th March, 1978, under sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957) the Central Government gave notice of its intention to prospect for coal in lands measuring 270.00 acres (approximately) or 109.26 hectares (approximately) in the locality specified in the schedule appended hereto;

And whereas in respect of the said lands, no notice under sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act, has been given;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the said sub-section (1) of Section 7, the Central Government hereby specified a further period of one year commencing from 25th March, 1978, as the period within which the Central Government may give notice of its intention to acquire the said lands or any rights in or over such lands.

## SCHEDULE

Pindra-Datma Extension Block				Drg. No. Rev./62/77 dt. 15-11-1977.		
(West Bokaro Coalfield)			(Showing land notified for prospecting)			
Sl.	Village	Thana	Thana No.	District	Area	Remarks
1.	Rabodh	Mandu	51	Hazaribagh	Part.	
Total area : —270.00 acres (approximately) or 109.26 hec. (approximately)						

## Boundary Description :—

A—B line passes through village Rabodh.

B—C line passes through village Rabodh.

C—D line passes along part common boundary of villages Rabodh and Datma (which is also part common boundary of Datma Colliery).

D—A line passes along part common boundary of villages Pindra and Rabodh (which is also the part common boundary of Pindra Colliery) and meets at starting point 'A'.

[No. 19(1)/80-CL]

कां० 543.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि इससे उपाखण्ड अनुसूची में उल्लिखित भूमि में कोयला अभिप्राप्त किए जाने की संभावना है; अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, कोयला वाले क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, कोयले का पूर्वोक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है;

2. इस अधिसूचना के अधीन आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक का निरीक्षण सेंट्रल कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड का कार्यालय, (सम्पदा विभाग) बरभंगा हाउस, रांची-834001 में या जिला मजिस्ट्रेट का कार्यालय धनकानल (उड़ीसा) में अथवा कोयला नियंत्रक का कार्यालय, 1 काउन्सिल हाउस स्ट्रीट कलकत्ता-700001 में किया जा सकता है।

इस अधिसूचना के अधीन आने वाली भूमि में हितबद्ध सभी व्यक्ति, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 13 की उपधारा (7) में विनिर्दिष्ट सभी नक्शों, चाटों और अन्य दस्तावेजों को, इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से 90 दिन के भीतर राजस्व अधिकारी, सेंट्रल कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड, बरभंगा हाउस, रांची-834001 को भेजेंगे।

अनुसूची  
दक्षिण बालन्दा विस्तारण  
तलचर कोयला क्षेत्र  
जिला धनकानल (उड़ीसा)

रेखांक सं० राज०/82/79  
तारीख 7-11-1979  
(जिसमें पूर्वोक्षण के लिए भूमि दर्शित है)

क्रम सं०	ग्राम	थाना	उपखण्ड	थाना सं०	जिला	क्षेत्रफल	टिप्पण
1.	घण्टापारा कोलियरी तलचर				धनकानल	320.00	भाग
कुल :						320.00 एकड़ (लगभग) या 129.50 हेक्टर (लगभग)	

सीमा वर्णन :

कक्ष : रेखा बालन्दा और घण्टापारा, हीरापुर और घण्टापारा (जो कोयला अधिनियम की धारा 9(1) के अधीन अर्जित दक्षिण बालन्दा की सीमा के साथ सामान्य सीमा बनाती है) की भागतः सामान्य सीमा के साथ जाती है।

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
ख-ग-घ-ङ-च-छ :	रेखा ग्राम घण्टापारा में से होकर जाती है ।			
छ-ज :	रेखा ग्राम घण्टापारा (जो कोयला अधिनियम की धारा 9(1) के अधीन अर्जित दक्षिण बालन्दा की सीमा के साथ सामान्य सीमा बनाती है) से होकर जाती है ।			
ज-झ :	रेखा ग्राम डेरा और घण्टापारा (जो कोयला अधिनियम की धारा 9(1) के अधीन अर्जित दक्षिण बालन्दा की सीमा के साथ सामान्य सीमा बनाती है) की भागतः सामान्य सीमा के साथ साथ जाती है ।			
झ-ञ :	रेखा ग्राम घण्टापारा (जो कोयला अधिनियम की धारा 9(1) के अधीन अर्जित दक्षिण बालन्दा की सीमा के साथ सामान्य सीमा बनाती है) से हो कर जाती है ।			

[सं० 19(42)/79-सी०एल०]

श्रीमती के० सूद, प्रवर सचिव

S.O. 543. —Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the Coal is likely to be obtained from the lands in the locality mentioned in the Schedule thereto annexed,

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section(1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development), Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to prospect for coal therein.

The plan of the area covered by this notification can be inspected at the Office of the Central Coalfields limited (Revenue Section), Darbhanga House, Ranchi-834001, or at the Office of the District Magistrate, Dhenkanal (Orissa), or at the Office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House, Street, Calcutta-700001.

All persons interested in the land covered by this notification shall deliver all maps, charts and other documents referred to in sub-section (7) of section 13 of the said Act to the Revenue Officer, Central Coalfields limited Darbhanga House, Ranchi 834001 within 90 days from the date of the publication of this notification.

## SCHEDULE

South Balanda Extn.

Talcher Coalfield

Distt. Dhenkanal (Orissa).

Drg. No. Rev./82/79

Dated 7-11-1979

(Showing lands notified for prospecting)

Sl. No.	Village	P.S.	Sub-division	Thana No.	District	Area in acre	Remarks.
1.	Ghantapara Coliery		Talcher	—	Dhenkanal	320.00	Part.
Total : —320.00 acres (approximately) or 129.50 hect. (approximately)							

## Boundary description :

A—B line passes along the part common boundary of villages Balanda and Ghantapara, Hirapur and Ghantapara (which form common boundary with the boundary of South Balanda acquired u/s 9(1) of the Coal Act.)

B—C—D—E—F—G—lines pass through village Ghantapara.

G—H line passes through village Ghantapara (which form common boundary with the boundary of South Balanda acquired u/s 9(1) of the Coal Act.

H—I line passes along the part common boundary of villages Dera and Ghantapara (which forms common boundary with the boundary of South Balanda notified u/s 9(1) of the Coal Act.

I—A line passes through village Ghantapara (which forms common boundary with the boundary of South Balanda acquired u/s 9(1) of the Coal Act and meets at starting point 'A'.

[No. 19(42)/79-CL]

Smt. K. SOOD, Deputy Secy.

## नौचढ़न और परितहन मंत्रालय

(परिवहन पक्ष)

नई दिल्ली, 22 फरवरी, 1980

का० ध्रा० 544.—कमिपय डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीमों में और संशोधन करने के लिए स्कीम का निम्नलिखित प्रारूप जिसे केन्द्रीय सरकार डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) नियम, 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, बनाने की प्रस्थापना करती है, उक्त उपधारा द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित, उन सभी व्यक्तियों की जानकारी के लिए प्रकाशित किया जाता है जिनके उनमें प्रभावित होने की संभावना है और यह सूचना दी जाती है कि उक्त प्रारूप पर, इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से दो मास की अवधि की समाप्ति पर या उसके पश्चात् विचार किया जाएगा।

उक्त अधिसूचना की बावत इस प्रकार विनिर्दिष्ट अवधि से पूर्व किसी व्यक्ति से जो आपत्तियाँ या सुझाव प्राप्त होंगे, उनपर केन्द्रीय सरकार विचार करेगी।

## प्रारूप स्कीम

1 (1) इस स्कीम का नाम डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) संशोधन स्कीम, 1980 है।

(2) यह राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होगी।

2. अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट स्कीम, उसमें उल्लिखित रीति से, संशोधित की जाती है।

## अनुसूची

क्रम संक्षिप्त नाम संख्या	संशोधन
(1)	(2)
1. मुम्बई डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम,	(i) खण्ड 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक में, "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्दों के स्थान पर, "एक हजार छह सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;
	(ii) खण्ड 9 उप खण्ड (अ) में,—
	(क) उप-मद (i) में, "एक हजार रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;
	(ख) उप मद (ii) में, "एक हजार रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;
	(iii) खण्ड 10, मद (क) में, "सात सौ पचास रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;
	(iv) खण्ड 11, मद (छ) के परन्तुक में, "पाँच सौ पचास रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार एक सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;

(1) (2)

(3)

2. मद्रास डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1956

- (i) खण्ड 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक में, "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;
- (ii) खण्ड 9, उपखण्ड (1), मद (अ) में, "एक हजार रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;
- (iii) खण्ड 10, मद (ब) में, "सात सौ पचास रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;
- (iv) खण्ड 11, मद (छ) के परन्तुक में, "चार सौ रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "आठ सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे।

3. मद्रास रजिस्ट्रीकृत डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1957

- (i) खण्ड 4 कक, मद (अ) में, "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए से कम" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए तक" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;
- (ii) खण्ड 5, उपखण्ड (1) मद (छ) में, "एक हजार रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे।

4. कोचीन डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1959

- (i) खण्ड 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक में, "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;
- (ii) खण्ड 9, उपखण्ड (i), मद (अ) में, "एक हजार रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;
- (iii) खण्ड 10, मद (ब) में, सात सौ पचास रुपए शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;
- (iv) खण्ड 11, मद (छ) के परन्तुक में, "चार सौ रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "आठ सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे।

5. विशाखा पत्तनम डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1959

- (i) खण्ड 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक में, "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;

(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
	(ii) खण्ड 9, उपखण्ड (1) मद (अ) में, "एक हजार रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;		8. कांड़ला घरजिस्तीकृत डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1968	(i) खण्ड 5 के प्रथम परन्तुक में, "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;	
	(iii) खण्ड 10, मद (च) में, "सात सौ पचास रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;			(ii) खण्ड 7, उपखण्ड (1), मद (इ) में, "एक हजार रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;	
	(iv) खण्ड 11, मद (छ) के परन्तुक में, "चार सौ रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "आठ सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे।			(iii) खण्ड 9, मद (ह) के परन्तुक में, "चार सौ रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "आठ सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे।	
6. मारमुगाघो डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1965	(i) खण्ड 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक में, "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;		9. कांड़ला, डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1969	(i) खण्ड 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक में, "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;	
	(ii) खण्ड 10, उपखण्ड (1), मद (अ) में,—			(ii) खण्ड 10, उपखण्ड (1) मद (अ) में,—	
	(क) उपमद (i) में, "एक हजार रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;			(क) उपमद (i) में, "एक हजार रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;	
	(ख) उपमद (ii) में, "एक हजार रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;			(ख) उपमद (ii) में, "एक हजार रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;	
	(iii) खण्ड 11, मद (ब) में, "सात सौ पचास रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;			(iii) खण्ड II में, निम्नलिखित जोड़ा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—	
	(iv) खण्ड 12, मद (छ) के परन्तुक में, "चार सौ रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "आठ सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे।			"(ब) ऐसे पदों पर नियुक्ति करता जिनका अधिकतम वेतन, भत्तों के अनिश्चित, एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए प्रति मास से अधिक नहीं है";	
7. विशाखापत्तनम घरजिस्तीकृत डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1968	(i) खण्ड 5 के प्रथम परन्तुक में, "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;		10. मुम्बई छीलन और रंगरोपन कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1969	(i) खण्ड 5 के प्रथम परन्तुक में, "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;	
	(ii) खण्ड 9, उपखण्ड (1), मद (ज) में "एक हजार रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;			(ii) खण्ड 9, उपखण्ड (i), मद (घ) में,—	
	(iii) खण्ड 12, मद (छ) के परन्तुक में, "चार सौ रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "आठ सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे।			(घ) उपमद (1) में, "एक हजार रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
		(ख) उप मद (2) में "एक हजार रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;			(ख) परन्तुक में, "पाँच सौ पचाहत्तर रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार एक सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे।
		(iii) खण्ड II, मद (छ) के परन्तुक में, "पाँच सौ पचाहत्तर रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार एक सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे।	13. कलकत्ता डाक लिपिकीय और पर्यवेक्षी कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1970	(i)	खण्ड 5, उपखण्ड (4) के प्रथम परन्तुक में, "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;
11. कलकत्ता डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1970	(i)	खण्ड 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक में "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;		(ii)	खण्ड 9, उपखण्ड (1) की मद (ज) में, "एक हजार रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे।
	(ii)	खण्ड 10, उपखण्ड (1), मद (अ) में, "एक हजार रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;	14. मुम्बई श्रमिस्त्रीकृत डाक निकासी और अप्रपण कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1973	(i)	खण्ड 5 के प्रथम परन्तुक में, "एक हजार रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;
	(iii)	खण्ड II, मद (च) में, "सात सौ पचास रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;		(ii)	खण्ड 7, मद (i) में,—“1250 रु० से कम नहीं” शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए से कम नहीं" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;
	(iv)	खण्ड 12, मद (ज)(iv) में, "पाँच सौ पचाहत्तर रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार एक सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;		(iii)	खण्ड 8, उपखण्ड (i) मद (अ) में,—
	(v)	खण्ड 12, मद (ज)(iv) के परन्तुक में, "पाँच सौ पचाहत्तर रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार एक सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे।		(क)	उपमद (1) में, "एक हजार रुपए से कम" शब्दों के स्थान पर, "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए तक" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;
12. कलकत्ता छीलन और रंग-रोगन कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1970	(i)	खण्ड 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक में, "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ पचास रुपए और उससे अधिक" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;		(ख)	उपमद (ii) में, "एक हजार रुपए से कम" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए तक" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;
	(ii)	खण्ड 10 उपखण्ड (1), मद (अ) में, "एक हजार रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार छह सौ रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;		(iv)	खण्ड 9, मद (क) में, "सात सौ पचास रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे।
	(iii)	खण्ड II, मद (च) में, "सात सौ पचास रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार दो सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;			
	(iv)	खण्ड 12, मद (ज)(iv) में,—			
	(क)	"पाँच सौ पचाहत्तर रुपए" शब्दों के स्थान पर "एक हजार एक सौ पचास रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएंगे;			

[फा० संख्या एल डी प्रो/183/77-डी-1]

बी० संकरालिंगम, अवर सचिव

## MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT

(Transport Wing)

New Delhi the 22 February, 1980

S.O. 544 :—The following draft of the Scheme further to amend certain Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Schemes, which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), is hereby published as required by the said sub-section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the expiry of a period of two months from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the period so specified will be taken into consideration by the Central Government.

#### DRAFT SCHEME

1. (1) This Scheme may be called the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1980.

(2) It shall come into force from the date of its publication in the Official Gazette.

2. The Schemes specified in the Schedule are hereby amended in the manner mentioned therein.

#### SCHEDULE

S. No.	Short title	Amendment
(1)	(2)	(3)
1. The Bombay Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1956	(i) in the first proviso to clause 6, for the words "rupees one thousand two hundred and fifty and above" the words "one thousand six hundred and fifty and above" shall be substituted;	(i) in clause 9, in sub-clause (1), in item (j), for the words "rupees one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;
	(ii) in clause 9, in sub-clause (J), (a) in sub-item (1), for the words "rupees one thousand" the words "one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted; (b) in sub-item (ii) for the words "rupees one thousand" the words "rupees one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;	(iii) in clause 10, in item (f), for the words "seven hundred and fifty" the words "one thousand two hundred and fifty" shall be substituted;
	(iii) in clause 10, in item (e), for the words "rupees seven hundred and fifty" the words "rupees one thousand two hundred and fifty" shall be substituted;	(iv) in clause 11, in the proviso to item (g), for the words "rupees five hundred and seventy-five" the words "one thousand one hundred and fifty" shall be substituted.
2. The Madras Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1956	(i) in the first proviso to clause 6, for the words "rupees one thousand two hundred and fifty and above" the words "rupees one thousand six hundred and fifty and above" shall be substituted;	(ii) in clause 11, in the proviso to item (g), for the words "rupees four hundred" the words "rupees eight hundred and fifty" shall be substituted.
3. The Madras Un-registered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1957	(i) in clause 4AA, in item (j), for the words "less than rupees one thousand two hundred and fifty", the words "upto rupees one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;	
4. The Cochin Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1959	(i) in the first proviso to clause 6, for the words "one thousand two hundred and fifty and above" the words "one thousand six hundred and fifty and above" shall be substituted;	
	(ii) in clause 9, in sub-clause (1) in item (j), for the words "rupees one thousand" the words "rupees one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;	
	(iii) in clause 10, in item (f), for the words "rupees seven hundred and fifty" the words "one thousand two hundred and fifty" shall be substituted;	
	(iv) in clause 11, in proviso to item (g), for the words "rupees four hundred" the words "rupees eight hundred and fifty" shall be substituted.	



(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
5. The Visakhapatnam Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1959.		<p>(i) in the first proviso to clause 6, for the words "one thousand two hundred and fifty and above" the words "one thousand six hundred and fifty and above" shall be substituted;</p> <p>(ii) in clause 9, in sub-clause (1), in item (j), for the words "rupees one thousand" the words "rupees one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;</p> <p>(iii) in clause 10, in item (f) for the words "rupees seven hundred and fifty" the words "one thousand two hundred and fifty" shall be substituted;</p> <p>(iv) in clause 11, in the proviso to item (g), for the words "rupees four hundred" the words "rupees eight hundred and fifty" shall be substituted.</p>	7. The Visakhapatnam Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1968.		<p>(i) in the first proviso to clause 5, for the words "rupees one thousand two hundred and fifty and above" the words "one thousand six hundred and fifty and above" shall be substituted;</p> <p>(ii) in clause 9, in sub-clause (1), in item (h), for the words "rupees one thousand" the words "one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;</p> <p>(iii) in clause 12, in the proviso to item (g), for the words "rupees four hundred" the words "rupees eight hundred and fifty" shall be substituted;</p>
6. The Mormugao Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1965.		<p>(i) in the first proviso to clause 6 for the words "rupees one thousand two hundred and fifty and above" the words "rupees one thousand six hundred and fifty and above" shall be substituted;</p> <p>(ii) in clause 10, in sub-clause (1), in item (j),— (a) in sub-item (i), for the words "rupees one thousand" the words "rupees one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;</p> <p>(b) in sub-item (ii) for the words "rupees one thousand" the words "rupees one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;</p> <p>(iii) in clause 11, in item (f), for the words "seven hundred and fifty" the words "one thousand two hundred and fifty" shall be substituted;</p> <p>(iv) in clause 12, in the proviso to item (g) for the words "rupees four hundred" the words "rupees eight hundred and fifty" shall be substituted.</p>	8. The Kandla Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1968.		<p>(i) in the first proviso to clause 5, for the words "rupees one thousand two hundred and fifty and above" the words "rupees one thousand six hundred and fifty and above" shall be substituted;</p> <p>(ii) in clause 7, in sub-clause (1), in item (e), for the words "rupees one thousand" the words "rupees one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;</p> <p>(iii) in clause 9, in the proviso to item (e), for the words "rupees four hundred" the words "rupees eight hundred and fifty" shall be substituted.</p>
			9. The Kandla Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1969.		<p>(i) in the first proviso to clause 6, for the words "rupees one thousand two hundred and fifty" the words "rupees one thousand six hundred and fifty" shall be substituted;</p> <p>(ii) in clause 10, in sub-clause (1), in item (j),— (a) in sub-item (i), for the words "rupees one thousand" the words "rupees one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;</p>

(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
		(b) in sub-item (ii), for the words "rupees one thousand" the words "rupees one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;			(iii) in clause 11, in item (f), for the words "seven hundred and fifty" the words "one thousand two hundred and fifty" shall be substituted;
		(iii) in clause 11, the following shall be added, namely :— "(f) make appointments to the posts the maximum salary of which exclusive of allowances, is not more than rupees one thousand two hundred and fifty per mensem;"			(iv) In clause 12, in item (h) (iv) for the words "rupees five hundred and seventy five" the words "one thousand one hundred and fifty" shall be substituted;
		(iv) in clause 12, in the proviso to item (g), for the words "rupees four hundred" the words "rupees eight hundred and fifty" shall be substituted.			(v) in clause 12, in the proviso to item (h) (iv), for the words "rupees five hundred and seventy five" the words "rupees one thousand one hundred and fifty" shall be substituted.
10. The Bombay Chipping and Painting Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1969		(i) in the first proviso to clause 5, for the words "one thousand two hundred and fifty and above" the words "one thousand six hundred and fifty and above" shall be substituted ;	12. The Calcutta Chipping and Painting Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1970.		(i) in the first proviso to clause 6, for the words "rupees one thousand two hundred and fifty and above" the words "rupees one thousand and six hundred and fifty and above" shall be substituted;
		(ii) in clause 9, in sub-clause (1), in item (j),— (a) in sub-item (i) for the words "rupees one thousand" the words "rupees one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;			(ii) in clause 10, in sub-clause (1) in item (j) for the words "rupees one thousand" the words "rupees one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;
		(b) in sub-item (ii), for the words "rupees one thousand" the words "rupees one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;			(iii) in clause 11, in item (f), for the words "rupees seven hundred and fifty" the words "rupees one thousand two hundred and fifty" shall be substituted;
		(iii) in clause 11, in the proviso to item (g), for the words "rupees five hundred and seventy-five" the words "rupees one thousand one hundred and fifty" shall be substituted.			(iv) in clause 12, in item (h) (iv),— (a) for the words "rupees five hundred and seventy five" the words "rupees one thousand one hundred and fifty" shall be substituted;
11. The Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1970.		(i) in the first proviso to clause 6, for the words "rupees one thousand two hundred and fifty and above" the words "rupees one thousand six hundred and fifty and above" shall be substituted;			(b) in the proviso for the words "rupees five hundred and seventy five" the words "rupees one thousand one hundred and fifty" shall be substituted.
		(ii) in clause 10, in sub-clause (1), in item (j), for the words "rupees one thousand" the words "one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;	13. The Calcutta Dock Clerical and Supervisory Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1970.		(i) in clause 5, in the first proviso to sub-clause (4), for the words "rupees one thousand two hundred and fifty and above" the words "rupees one thousand six hundred and fifty and above" shall be substituted;

- |     |     |     |
|-----|-----|-----|
| (1) | (2) | (3) |
|-----|-----|-----|
- (ii) in clause 9, in the item (h) of sub-clause (1) for the words "rupees one thousand" the words "rupees one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;
14. The Bombay Unregistered Dock Clearing and Forwarding Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1973.
- (i) in the first proviso to clause 5, for the words "rupees one thousand and above" the words "rupees one thousand and six hundred and fifty and above" shall be substituted;
- (ii) in clause 7, in the item (1), for the words "not less than Rs. 1250" the words "not less than rupees one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;
- (iii) in clause 8, in sub-clause (1), in item (j),—
- (a) in sub-item (i), for the words "below rupees one thousand" the words "upto rupees one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;
- (b) in sub-item (ii), for the words "below rupees one thousand" the words "upto one thousand and six hundred" shall be substituted;
- (iv) in clause 9, in item (e), for the words "seven hundred and fifty rupees" the words "rupees one thousand, two hundred and fifty" shall be substituted.

[No. LDO/183/77-D-1]

V. SANKARALINGAM, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 25 फरवरी, 1980

**व्यापार पोत परिवहन**

का० प्रा० 545.—व्यापार पोत परिवहन अधिनियम, 1958 (1958 का 44) की धारा 237 और 238 के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारत सरकार के नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० 195 दिनांक 31 दिसम्बर 1977 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिनियम में नीचे दी गई सारणी में प्रविष्टि,—

"नागपट्टनम पम्बन	}	पत्तन अधिकारी, नागपट्टनम"
---------------------	---	---------------------------

के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित रखा जाए, अर्थात् :—

"नागपट्टनम पम्बन	—	पत्तन अधिकारी, नागपट्टनम पम्बन — पत्तन अधिकारी, रामेश्वरम"
---------------------	---	---

[संख्या 5 एम० एन०आर० (28)/78-एम० ए०]

New Delhi, the 25th February, 1980.

**MERCHANT SHIPPING**

S.O. 545 :—In exercise of the powers conferred by sections 237 and 238 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 (44 of 1958), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Shipping and Transport No. S.O. 195, dated the 31st December, 1977, namely:—

In the Table set out below the said Notification, for the entry,—

"Nagapattinam Pamban	}	Port Officer, Nagapattinam",
-------------------------	---	------------------------------

the following entries shall be substituted, namely :—

"Nagapattinam — Pamban —	Port Officer, Nagapattinam Port Officer, Rameshwaram".
-----------------------------	---

[No. 5-MSR(28)/78-MA]

का० प्रा० 546.—नाविक भविष्य निधि योजना, 1966 के पैरा 3 के उप पैरा (1) के साथ पठित नौवहन भविष्य निधि अधिनियम, 1966 (1966 का 4) की धारा 5 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार इस अधिसूचना के द्वारा नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय में नौवहन कल्याण कार्य से सम्बन्धित निदेशक को नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय में नौवहन कल्याण कार्य से सम्बन्धित भारत सरकार के उप सचिव के स्थान पर नौवहन भविष्य निधि के न्यासी मण्डल का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है और नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार की 10 जनवरी, 1977 की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 616 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, क्रम सं० 1 तथा तत्सम्बन्धी प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि की जाएगी :—

"1. नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय में नौवहन

कल्याण कार्य से सम्बन्धित निदेशक,— सरकारी अधिकारी ।

[फा० सं० एम० डब्ल्यू०एस० (40)/76-एम०टी०]

एम० एन० कक्कर, निदेशक

S.O. 546.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 5 of the Seamen's Provident Fund Act, 1966 (4 of 1966), read with sub-paragraph (1) of paragraph 3 of the Seamen's Provident Fund Scheme, 1966, the Central Government hereby appoints the Director, Ministry of Shipping & Transport, dealing with Seamen's Welfare as member of the Board of Trustees of the Seamen's Provident Fund in place of the Deputy Secretary to the Govt. of India, Ministry of Shipping & Transport dealing with Seamen's Welfare and makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Shipping and Transport (Transport Wing) No. S. O. 616, dated the 10th January, 1977, namely :—

In the said notification, for serial number 1 and the entries relating thereto, the following shall be substituted, namely :—

"1. Director

Ministry of Shipping & Transport —Government dealing with Seamen's Welfare	Official"
---	-----------

[P. No. MWS(40)/76-MT]  
S. N. KAKKAR, Director**निर्माण और आपास मंत्रालय**

नई दिल्ली, 21 फरवरी, 1980

का० प्रा० 547.—शोक परिसर (अनधिकृत दफ्तरकारों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का

प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित सारणी के स्तम्भ (1) में उल्लिखित अधिकारी को, जो सरकार के राश्रपत्रित अधिकारी के रैंक के समकक्ष अधिकारी हैं, सम्पदा अधिकारी के रूप में उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनार्थ नियुक्त करती और प्रदत्त शक्तियों का उपयोग करेगा और उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में निर्धारित परिसरों के बारे में इस अधिनियम के द्वारा या इसके अधीन सम्पदा अधिकारियों को दी गई शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेगा।

## सारणी

अधिकारी का पदनाम	लोक परिसर
1	2
सहायक निदेशक, पट्टा प्रशासन शाखा, दिल्ली में दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण आवास विभाग, दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण	द्वारा विकसित आवास सम्पदाओं की सीमाओं के अन्तर्गत दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण के परिसर।

[संख्या के०-11011/38/79-डी० डी०/ए०/1-बी०]

कृष्ण प्रताप, उप सचिव

## MINISTRY OF WORKS &amp; HOUSING

New Delhi, the 21st February, 1980

S.O. 547 :—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints the Officer mentioned in column (1) of the Table below being an officer equivalent to the rank of a gazetted officer of Government to be the Estate Officer for the purposes of the said Act, who shall exercise the powers conferred, and perform the duties imposed, on Estate Officers by or under this Act, in respect of the premises specified in column (2) of the said Table.

## TABLE

Designation of the Officer	Public Premises
1	2
Assistant Director, Lease Administration Branch Housing Department, Delhi Development Authority.	Premises belonging to the Delhi Development Authority situated within the limits of the Housing Estates, developed by Delhi Development Authority, in Delhi.

[No. K-11011/38/79-DD 1-A/I-B]  
KRISHNA PRATAP, Dy. Secy.

## दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण

(सर्वेक्षण और निपटारा एकक 1)

नई दिल्ली, 26 फरवरी, 1980

का०श्रा० 548.—दिल्ली विकास अधिनियम, 1957 (अधिनियम 1957 का 61) की धारा 22 की उपधारा (4) के अन्तर्गत केन्द्रीय सरकार ने भूमि एवं विकास कार्यालय, निर्माण एवं आवास मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार, नई दिल्ली के अधीन नीचे दी गई अनुसूची में निर्धारित भूमि के निपटारे हेतु दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण को नियुक्त किया और अब यह भूमि नई दिल्ली नगर पालिका को स्थानांतरित की जाती है।

## अनुसूची

सरोजनी नगर के समीप (रिंग रोड नाले के साथ नेताजी नगर) स्थित भूखण्ड सं० / माईट सं० 21 का अधिसूचना सं० एस०श्रा० 4719 दि० 21-8-75 के अनुसार लगभग 1350 वर्गमीटर (लगभग 1615 वर्ग गज) भूमि के भाग को दिखाया गया है।

उपर्युक्त भूमि की सीमा का विवरण इस प्रकार है :—

उत्तर : सड़क

दक्षिण : रिंग रोड और पेट्रोल पंप

पूर्व : सड़क

पश्चिम : सरकारी भूमि

[सं० एस०एण्डएस 33(35)/79एस०श्रा०(1)/334-336]

हरी राम गोयल, सचिव

## DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

(Survey &amp; Settlement Unit. I)

New Delhi, the 26th February, 1980

S.O. 548.—In pursuance of the provisions of Sub-section (4) of Section 22 of the Delhi Development Act, 1957 (61 of 1957), the Delhi Development Authority has replaced at the disposal of the Central Government the land described in the schedule below for placing it at the disposal of the Land and Development Office, Ministry of Works & Housing, Govt. of India, New Delhi for further transfer to the New Delhi Municipal Committee.

## SCHEDULE

Piece of land measuring about 1350 Sq. Metre (about 1615 Sq. yds.) situated Near Sarojini Nagar (Ring Road along Nallah, bearing Plot No./Site No. 21 partly/full of-Notification No. S.O. 4719 Dated 21-8-75.

The above piece of land is bounded as follows :—

North : By Road.

South : by Ring Road &amp; Petrol Pump.

East : by Road.

West : by Govt. Land.

[No. S&amp;S 33(35)/79/ASO(I)/334-336]

H. R. GOEL, Secy.

## पूति और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय

(पुनर्वास विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 22 फरवरी, 1980

का०श्रा० 549.—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (प्रतिकर तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम, 1954 (1954 का 44) की धारा 34 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार इसके द्वारा निर्देश देती है कि हरियाणा राज्य में स्थित अजित निष्कात सम्पत्तियों और भूमियों के संबंध में उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 24 की उपधारा 4 तथा धारा 33 के अधीन शक्तियों का प्रयोग श्री बी० पी० जोहर, वित्तीय आयुक्त राजस्व, हरियाणा सरकार, चण्डीगढ़ द्वारा भी किया जाएगा। एतत् यह होगा कि वे इन शक्तियों का प्रयोग उन मामलों में नहीं करेंगे जिनमें उन्होंने किसी अन्य क्षमता में अदेश प्राप्त किए हों।

2. इसमें तत्कालीन श्रम, रोजगार और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (पुनर्वास विभाग) की दिनांक 7 अप्रैल, 1970 की अधिसूचना संख्या 3(2)/69-श्र० व पुन० का अतिरिक्त किया जाता है।

[संख्या 1(14)/वि०न०/75-एस०एस०-2]

एन० एस० नाथानी, अवर सचिव

## MINISTRY OF SUPPLY &amp; REHABILITATION

(Department of Rehabilitation)

New Delhi, the 22nd February, 1980

S.O. 549.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 34 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation & Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954) the Central Government hereby directs that powers exercisable by it under sub-section 4 of section 24 and section 33 of the said Act, shall be exercisable also by Shri V. P. Johar, Financial Commissioner Revenue, Government of Haryana, Chandigarh, in respect of proceedings pertaining to acquire evacuee properties and lands, situated within the State of Haryana, subject to the condition that he shall not exercise any of such powers in relation to any matter in which an order has been made by him in any other capacity.

2. This supersedes Notification of the Government of India in the erstwhile Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Rehabilitation) Office of the Chief Settlement Commissioner, New Delhi No. 3(2)/69-1.&R dated the 7th April, 1970.

[No. 1(14) Spl. Cell/75-SS.II]  
N. M. WADHWANI, Under Secy.

### रेल मंचालय

(रेलवे बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 20 फरवरी, 1980

कां० 550.—भारतीय रेल अधिनियम, 1890 (1890 का अधिनियम 9) की धारा 82-बी द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा श्री एम० सदानन्द स्वामी, उच्च न्यायालय के सेवानिवृत्त मुख्य न्यायमूर्ति गुवाहाटी को 3-12-79 को दक्षिण मध्य रेलवे के दुबली मंडल पर बेलगाम—लंडा मोटर लाइन डकहरी लाइन खंड के देसुरखानापुर स्टेशनों के बीच 204 महालक्ष्मी एक्सप्रेस के बुधटनाग्रस्त होने से उत्पन्न सभी दावों को निपटाने के लिए दावा आयुक्त के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० 79/ई०(प्र०) II/1/3]  
के० बालचन्द्रन, सचिव, रेलवे बोर्ड एवं  
भारत सरकार के पदेन संयुक्त सचिव

### MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS

(Railway Board)

New Delhi, the 20th February, 1980

S.O. 551.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri M. Sadananda Swamy, Retired Chief Justice of High Court, Gauhati as Claims Commissioner to deal with all the claims arising out of the accident involving 204 Mahalakshmi Express between Desur-Khanapur stations of Belgaum-Londa MG single line section on Hubli Division of South Central Railway on 3-12-79. His headquarters will be at Belgaum.

[No. 79/E(O)II/1/3]  
K. BALACHANDRAN, Secy. ex-officio Jt. Secy.

### MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 20th February, 1980

S.O. 551.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal New Delhi, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Union Bank of India, Bombay and their workmen over stoppage of three increments of Shri Ashok Kapoor, Clerk-cum-Typist with permanent effect, which was received by the Central Government on the 12-2-1980.

BEFORE SHRI MAHESHI CHANDRA, PRESIDING  
OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-  
CUM-LABOUR COURT, NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 41 of 1978

In re :

The General Secretary,  
Union Bank Employees' Union (Punjab) Regd.,  
Jullundur City ... Petitioner

Versus

The Deputy General Manager (Personnel),  
Union Bank of India,  
230, Backlay Reclamation Nauman Point,  
Bombay. ... Respondent

### AWARD

The Central Govt. as appropriate Govt. referred an Industrial Dispute under section 10 of the I.D. Act vide its order No. L-12012/117/77-D.II.A dated the 5th April, 1978 to this Tribunal in the following terms :

'Whether the action of the management of the Union Bank of India in imposing the punishment of stoppage of three increments with permanent effect on Shri Ashok Kapoor, Clerk-cum-Typist Chandigarh Branch of the Bank on the basis of alleged misconduct of the 23rd July, 1974 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?'

2. On receipt of the reference it was ordered to be registered and usual notices were sent to the parties concerned and in consequence whereof a statement of claim was filed on behalf of the workman. Thereafter a written statement also was filed by the Bank. Upon the pleadings of the parties the following issues were framed vide my order dated the 9th February, 1978 for trial :—

1. Whether the dispute has been properly espoused?
2. Whether the union has no right to represent or espouse?
3. Whether the statement of claim is properly signed and verified?
4. Whether matter referred does not qualify as an Industrial Dispute?
5. As in the order of reference?

3. Thereafter the case was adjourned for evidence of the workman to 12th April, 1979. On 12th April, 1979 the evidence of the workman was not present and Shri R. C. Pathak, the counsel for the workman requested for an adjournment and in consequence the case was adjourned to 25th May, 1979 for evidence of the workman. On 29th May, 1979 none appeared for the workman while Shri Jagat Arora had appeared for the Management and in consequence the ex parte order was passed against the workman and the case was adjourned to 31st May, 1979 for the evidence of the Bank. On 31st May, 1979 also none appeared for the workman and Shri Jagat Arora appeared for the Bank and the statement of Shri Ravindra Raj, the Personnel Officer of the Bank was recorded and case was adjourned for arguments to 1st June, 1979. On 1st June, 1979 an application for setting aside order was filed on behalf of the workman by Shri R. C. Pathak and for reply the case adjourned to 6th July, 1979. Thereafter the case was adjourned to 8th August, 1979. Again on 8th August, 1979 none appeared for the workman while Shri Bharat Bhushan appeared for the Bank. In consequence the application for setting aside ex parte order was dismissed and the case was adjourned for arguments to the 12th September, 1979 and this is how the case has come up for arguments. On 12th September, 1979 adjournment was requested for arguments and the case was adjourned to the 16th October, 1979 and finally to 24th January, 1980 for arguments. On 24th January, 1980 during the course of arguments it was brought to my notice that the Management had produced its evidence only on the preliminary issues and therefore I thought it proper to record evidence on the whole case and accordingly the case was adjourned to today. Today the ex parte evidence on the whole case has been recorded which consists of statement of M.W.I. Ravindra Raj and M.W. 2, Gur Sharan Singh. From the perusal of ex parte evidence produced by the Management the defence of the Management is establishment and as such I have come to the conclusion that the workman is not entitled to any relief in this reference.

4. It is specifically alleged by Shri Ravindra Raj as M.W.I that no notice of demand was received from the Union by the Management. It is also stated by him that the matter was not espoused and as such the matter does not qualify as an Industrial Dispute. From the ex parte evidence it is established that the dispute was not properly espoused; that the matter does not qualify as an Industrial Dispute as no demand was ever raised with the Management by the workman or the Union. It is further established that the Union which has taken up the matter has no right to espouse the matter. From the perusal of the

statement of claim I find that it purports to have been signed by one Shri R. K. Kapoor alleged to be Executive Member of Union Bank Employees' Union but in the absence of any proof of espousal by the union it cannot be said that the statement of claim has been properly signed. The statement of claim is not at all verified either and in view of my discussion above issue Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 are decided against the workman.

5. Regarding issue no. 5 in view of my finding above issue No. 4 this issue would not arise. However, assuming for the sake of arguments that there was espousal and the statement of claim was properly verified and signed and the matter referred does qualify as an Industrial Dispute even then it cannot be said that the workman is entitled to any relief in this matter. From the perusal of order of reference I find that the action of the management in imposing the punishment of stoppage of three increments with permanent effect upon this workman has been challenged but in view of the statement of Shri Ravindra Raj M.W.1 read with the statement of M.W.2 I find that the order of punishment is valid order. Shri Gur Sharan Singh, M.W.2 is the person who was appointed Enquiry Officer vide circular Ex. M.W.1/1 and charge sheet Ex. M.W.1/3 was served upon the workman. In consequence whereof enquiry was held and the proceedings thereof Ex. M.W.2/1, Ex. M.W.2/2 are the findings of Enquiry Officer and Ex. M.W.2/3 is the record of proceedings of personal hearing given to the workman and the final findings is Ex. M.W.2/4. In consequence thereof order of punishment is Ex. M.W.2/5 was passed. Not only that the workman filed an appeal against the said order of punishment, the said appeal was dismissed as well. The copy of the appeal is Ex. M.W.1/4 and copy of order of appellate authority is Ex. M.W.1/5. From the perusal of the proceedings and the enquiry report I do not find that it suffers from any discrepancy. The enquiry has been held in accordance with principles of natural justice and for my discussions above, I hold that the action of the management of Union Bank of India in imposing the punishment of stoppage of three increments with permanent effect on Shri Ashok Kapoor, Clerk-cum-Typist, Chandigarh Branch of the Bank on the basis of alleged misconduct of 23rd July, 1974 is justified and that the workman is not entitled to any relief and it is awarded accordingly. However I leave the parties to bear their own costs.

MAHESH CHAND, Presiding Officer  
[No. L-12012/117/77-D.II (A)]

New Delhi, the 23rd February, 1980

**S.O. 522.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal New Delhi, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relations to the management of Allahabad Bank and their workman over not providing the temporary/officiating chance of special Assrs. to Shri Rama Kant Tandon, Clerk, which was received by the Central Government on the 19-2-80.

BEFORE SHRI MAHESH CHANDRA, PRESIDING  
OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-  
CUM-LABOUR COURT, NEW DELHI.

**I.D. No. 113 of 1977**

In re :

The President,  
Allahabad Bank Karamchari Sangh,  
47/130, Hatia,  
Kanpur.

... Petitioner

Versus

The General Manager,  
Allahabad Bank,  
Hazratganj, Lucknow.

... Respondent.

## AWARD

The Central Govt. as appropriate Govt. referred an Industrial Dispute vide its order No. L-12012/45/74-LR.III dated the 25th February, 1975 to Shri S. H. J. Naqvi, Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur in the following terms :

‘Whether the management of Allahabad Bank is justified in not providing the temporary officiating chance of Special Assistant to Shri Rama Kant Tandon, Clerk Allahabad Bank, Kanpur? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?’

2. On receipt of the reference the same was registered and usual notices were sent to the parties, in pursuance whereof a statement of claim was filed on behalf of the workman and the case was adjourned for written statement. Before any written statement was filed on behalf of the Bank this matter was transferred vide order No. L-12025/22/76 D-II(A), dated the 3rd June, 1978 to Industrial Tribunal, Delhi and it was ordered to be registered and notices were ordered to be issued for 30th November for written statement. But before any written statement could be filed before the Industrial Tribunal, Delhi this case was further transferred to this Tribunal vide order No. L-12025(22)/76-D. II(A)D.IV(B), dated the 13th May, 1977. On receipt of the file and the order the reference was registered as I.D. No. 113/1977 and notices were issued to the parties. Both the parties put in appearance on the 28th October, 1977 before this Tribunal for the first time and thereafter a written statement was filed on behalf of the Management. Finally a replication was also filed on behalf of the workman. From the perusal of statement of claim filed on behalf of the workman I find that it is contended therein that the workman Rama Kant Tandon was working in Allahabad Bank as a clerk since 1-3-1950; that by virtue of his seniority he got officiating promotion as Special Assistant in accordance with promotion policy agreement dated 24-9-68 but thereafter he was not given any officiating or temporary promotion in violation of the Promotion Policy agreement and hence this reference.

3. In its written statement the Bank has contended that the workman had refused regular promotion on permanent basis twice and as such thereafter according to the service rules he was debarred from any chance of officiating or temporary promotion. It is also urged by the Bank that there was no Industrial Dispute in existence; that there was no proper espousal; that the reference was bad.

4. In its replication the workman has admitted that he did refuse regular promotion on permanent basis to the post of Special Assistant twice but that did not entitle the Bank to deny him the right of temporary/officiating promotion.

5. Before any issues could be framed on the pleadings of the parties it transpired that the preliminary objections were not pressed by the Bank and therefore the only issue which require determination by this Tribunal was the one referred in the order of reference.

6. The documents have been filed and admitted; denied. No oral evidence was produced by the parties in the matter rather the workman and Shri G. D. Maheshwari, the representative of the Bank came forward with the following statement on 5-3-1979 :

‘The parties do not propose to lead any oral evidence. The documents on record may be read into evidence and thereafter arguments be heard.’

7. The case was in consequence fixed for arguments. Thereafter number of hearings were granted for arguments but some how or the other no arguments could be heard and finally the case came up for arguments today. Today Shri R. B. Sharma for the Management appeared but none has appeared for the workman. Keeping in view the fact that number of opportunities have already been given for arguments I did not think it proper to adjourn the case for arguments and therefore I heard Mr. Sharma on behalf of the Bank and have gone through the file and after giving my considered thought to the matter before me I have come to the conclusion that the Bank was justified in not granting any officiating/temporary promotion as Special Assistant to the workman Shri Rama Kant Tandon.

8. From the perusal of the written statement I find that the contention of the Bank is that Shri Rama Kant Tandon had been offered opportunity of regular promotion as Special Assistant twice but he refused to avail the said opportunity and declined the offer on both the occasions and in consequence in terms of rule 11 of the Promotion Policy Agreement dated the 24th September, 1968 he was permanently debarred from any further promotion as Special Assistant whether in temporary or officiating capacity. Reference in this behalf may be made to para 4 of the written statement of the Bank. In reply to para 4 of the written statement of the Bank it is stated by the workman that he could not be debarred from officiating chances if the workman refused to accept the post of Special Assistant on two occasions. It is not alleged by the workman that he had not refused promotion offered to him twice. Rather in para 4 of his statement of claim it is indirectly admitted by him that he was offered the post of Special Assistant on permanent basis on two occasions but he refused. A reference to para 4 of his statement of claim would show that it is stated by him therein that the workman held the post of officiating Special Assistant for a fairly long time even after his refusal on second occasion to accept the post of Special Assistant on permanent basis. Thus on facts it is admitted that the workman had been offered promotion as Special Assistant on two occasions and he refused on both the occasions and consequently the Bank was justified in debarring him from any further promotion whether temporary or officiating as Special Assistant. A reference to the rules for promotion dated 24-9-1968 I find that it is specifically provided therein in para 11 that 'where a clerk who has been offered an appointment in the Special Assistants' cadre is not prepared for any reason to accept the appointment in the office to which he is posted, he will be given another chance after a period of one year subject of course to there being a vacancy then and if he is still unable to accept the offer no further chance will be given to him.' That being the position it cannot be said that the Bank was not justified in debarring this workman from any promotion on temporary/officiating or permanent basis to the post of Special Assistant. Rule 9 or 10 do not in any manner help the workman. In his replication the workman has tried to get benefit out of the promotion policy circular dated the 14th January, 1975, a copy on record but even this circular does not help the workman in as much as in part 7, para 7 of the said circular it is provided that 'non-acceptance of offer of promotion where an employee who has been offered promotion to a post attract special allowance in terms of the aforesaid rules, is not prepared for any reason to accept the appointment in the office to which he is posted within three days of the receipt of such offer in writing, he will be given another chance after a period of one year subject to three being vacancy then and if he is still unable to accept the offer, no further chance, not even an officiating chance, will be given to him thereafter.' This para specifically debars such a workman from even an officiating chance. Both the documents the circular dated 24-9-68 and the circular dated 14-1-75 are admitted by the workman as the endorsement on these documents shows. In view of this position of the rules of promotion it cannot be said that the workman is any longer entitled to the promotion as Special Assistant. Mere fact that the Bank has subsequent to the refusal by the workman given him temporary/officiating promotion referred to in para 4 of his replication would not create a right in the workman for any further chances of temporary/officiating or permanent promotion.

9. In view of my discussions above, I hold that the Management of Allahabad Bank is justified in not providing the temporary/officiating chance of Special Assistant to Shri Rama Kant Tandon, Clerk, Allahabad Bank, Kannur and that the said workman is not entitled to any relief whatsoever. I leave the parties to bear their own costs.

Dated : the 16th January 1980

MAHESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer

[No. I-12012/45/74-L.R.III/D. II(A)]

**S.O. 553.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Madras, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relations to the management of Reserve Bank of India, Madras and Shri S. Ponnuswamy, Clerk Grade-I

over withdrawing two stages of increments as a measure of punishment for making alleged false leave fare concession claim, which was received by the Central Government on the 19-2-1980.

BEFORE THIRU T. SUDARSANAM DANIEL, B.A., B.L.,  
PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
MADRAS

(Constituted by the Government of India)

Thursday, the 7th day of February, 1980

**Industrial Dispute No. 28 of 1979**

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the workmen and the Management of Reserve Bank of India, Madras.)

**BETWEEN**

The workmen represented by  
The Secretary,  
Reserve Bank of India Employees Association,  
C/o Reserve Bank of India, Fort Glasis,  
South Beach Road, Madras-600001.

**AND**

The Manager,  
Reserve of India, Fort Glasis,  
South Beach Road, Madras-600001.

**REFERENCE :**

Order No. L-12012/19/78-D.I.A., dated 15-5-1979 of the Ministry of Labour, Government of India.

This dispute coming on for final hearing on Friday, the 11th day of January, 1980 upon perusing the reference, claim and counter statements and all other material papers on record and upon hearing the arguments of Thiru K. Chandru for Thiruvalluvar Row and Reddy and K. Chandru, Advocates for the workmen and of Thiru N. V. Deshpande, Assistant Legal Adviser of the Bank appearing for the Management and this dispute having stood over till this day for consideration this Tribunal made the following :—

**AWARD**

This is an Industrial Dispute between the workmen and the Management of Reserve Bank of India, Madras referred to this Tribunal for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by the Government of India in Order No. L-12012/19/78-D.I.A. of the Ministry of Labour, in respect of the following issue :

Whether the action of the Management of Reserve Bank of India, Madras in withdrawing two stages of increments from Shri S. Ponnuswamy, Clerk Grade-I in the Madras Branch of the Bank as a measure of punishment for making alleged false leave fare concession claim is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?

(2) Facts leading upto the reference are not in controversy. Respondent is the Management of Reserve Bank of India, Madras-I. Sri S. Ponnuswamy is Clerk Grade-I in the Madras branch of the Reserve Bank of India. On 2-8-1975 under the original of Ex. M-17, the aforesaid Sri S. Ponnuswamy had applied for ordinary leave from 30-7-1975 to 13-8-1975. Ex. M-17 indicates that this ordinary leave applied for by the employee for the period from 30-7-1975 to 13-8-1975 was granted and he was asked to report for duty on 14-8-1975. While so he had submitted a leave fare concession bill dated 19-8-1975 (copy of which is marked as Ex. M-14) for having visited several places under the 2416 Kilometres Scheme and claimed a sum of Rs. 411.40 and from Ex. M-14 it can be noted that the office of the Management had indicated that the claimant-employee would only be entitled to Rs. 370 if otherwise the claim is in order. On 6-9-1975 the Deputy Chief Officer of the Reserve Bank of India issued a Memorandum to the claimant-employee to submit his reasons for making a leave fare concession while he was in Madras undergoing treatment under doctors including the Bank's Medical Officers. On 8-9-1975, he offered his explanation to the Deputy Chief Officer, Agricultural Credit Department, Reserve Bank of India, copy of which is marked as Ex. M-22. Even at this juncture it may be noted that under Ex. M-22 the claimant-employee has made

it clear that if the contents of the bill presented by him do not satisfy Deputy Chief Officer of the Reserve Bank of India he prayed that this may be treated as cancelled. However, the Deputy Chief Officer of the Reserve Bank of India pointed out certain discrepancies noted on the scrutiny of the leave fare concession bill presented by the claimant-employee. Copy of this proceeding is marked as Ex. M-1. The claimant-employee submitted his explanation on 1-11-1975, copy of which is marked as Ex. M-2. On 23-1-1976, the Deputy Chief Officer of the Reserve Bank of India comes to the conclusion that the claimant-employee has made a false leave fare concession claim after pointing out several irregularities, copy of which is marked as Ex. M-3. Therefore he is charged with having committed an act of misconduct within the meaning of Regulation 47 of the Reserve Bank of India (Staff) Regulations, 1948. The Staff Regulation has been marked as Ex. W-6. Copy of the explanation offered by the employee is marked as Ex. M-4. The employee's explanation was not accepted by the Management and therefore the Management had instituted a domestic enquiry. During the domestic enquiry, the employee Sri S. Ponnuswamy was assisted by Sri W.R. Varadarajan, an office bearer of the Reserve Bank of India Employees Association, Madras which Union incidentally has filed the claim statement in this reference on behalf of the aggrieved employee Sri S. Ponnuswamy. Ex. M-5 are the enquiry proceedings which commenced on 18th June, 1976 and concluded on 10-7-1976. The Enquiry Officer straight away asked the employee to offer his explanations with regard to certain materials appearing in the correspondence between the Management and the employee. That apart, no other witness was examined on behalf of the Management. Ex. M-6 is the findings of the Enquiry Officer at the oral enquiry. Thereafter, the Manager of the Reserve Bank of India, the competent authority has given his findings Ex. M-7 on 20-8-1976 holding that Sri S. Ponnuswamy has committed an act of misconduct by submitting a false leave fare concession claim and tentatively proposing to impose the following penalty :

"The substantive pay of Shri S. Ponnuswamy, Clerk Gr. I in the existing scale of Rs. 210-10-240-15-330-20-410-EB-25-460-30-520-35-590 shall be reduced by two stages. Accordingly, his present pay of Rs. 520 per mensem shall be reduced to Rs. 460 per mensem with effect from the date of the order. The reduction shall have the effect of postponing his future increments and his next increment in the said scale shall fall due on expiry of one year from the date of the order, when his substantive pay shall be fixed at Rs. 490 per mensem in the aforesaid scale subject otherwise to the provisions of Reserve Bank of India (Staff) Regulations, 1948."

Ex. M-9 is the final explanation offered by the employee. On receipt of this explanation, a second oral enquiry was held on 18-9-1976 by the Manager, proceedings of which had been marked as Ex. M-10. After taking all these factors into consideration the competent authority has passed the final order on 5-10-1976 under Ex. M-11. Against this finding of the Manager, the employee filed an appeal to the Governor, Reserve Bank of India, Bombay through proper channel. Ex. M-12 dated 4-4-1977 is the appeal. The Deputy Governor, Reserve Bank of India, Bombay had eventually passed the order in the Appeal on 1-11-1977 under Ex. M-13 confirming the findings sentence imposed by the competent authority. Subsequently, the Union raised the dispute before the Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Central), Madras. Ex. W-5 is the merits of discussion held between the Management and the Union. Ultimately, the Government of India has referred this dispute to this Tribunal.

(3) In the first place, it has to be seen whether the enquiry into the alleged misconduct of employee Sri S. Ponnuswamy is just, fair and proper. In brief, the case of the Management is that Sri S. Ponnuswamy committed an act of misconduct by submitting a false leave fare concession claim to the tune of Rs. 411.40. The employee is Clerk Grade-I in the Reserve Bank of India, Madras and as such he is Class III Staff of the Management as per Aiyar Award which has been produced for the perusal of this Tribunal. The Aiyar Award has been published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary Part-II Section 3, Sub-Section (ii) dated 5th March, 1968. Ex. M-14 is the copy of the leave fare con-

cession bill presented by the employee on 19-8-1975. The Deputy Chief Officer of the Agricultural Credit Department, Reserve Bank of India scrutinised the claim made by the employee and raised a doubt whether in fact the concerned journey was actually performed by the employee and the expenditure in question incurred.—vide Ex. M-21 (copy). Ex. M-22 is the copy of the reply sent by the employee on 8-9-1975. The Management was not satisfied with the explanation and therefore the show cause notice Ex. M-1 was issued. Ex. M-2 is the reply sent by the employee to the show cause notice. Ex. M-3 is the charge sheet issued to the employee and Ex. M-4 is the further explanation offered by the employee. Thereupon the Management instituted a domestic enquiry. Ex. M-5 are the enquiry proceedings. Ex. M-6 are the findings of the Enquiry Officer. Ex. M-7 are the findings of the competent authority. The Enquiry Officer as well as the competent authority held that the charge of misconduct has been established against the employee. Under Ex. M-7, the competent authority proposed the tentative penalty to be imposed and Ex. M-9 is the reply sent by the employee. The employee as well as his representative were held in the 2nd oral enquiry held on 18-9-1976. (Ex. M-10). Ex. M-11 is the final order passed by the competent authority. Ex. M-12 is the appeal preferred by the employee to the Governor of Reserve Bank of India. Ex. M-13 is the order of the Deputy Governor of Reserve Bank of India rejecting the appeal. The employee has also produced the taxi receipt for having paid Rs. 411—40, copy of which is marked as Ex. M-16. Ex. M-18 is the copy of the application for leave made by the employee and the recommendation made thereon. Ex. M-19 is the copy of the certificate of the Medical Officer, Staff Quarters, Reserve Bank of India Dispensary, Madras. Ex. M-20 is the copy of another certificate produced by the employee dated 14-8-1975 from a private Registered Medical Practitioner. On the strength of the claim made by the employee and the supporting documents and the clarifications offered by the employee to the doubts raised by the Management the domestic enquiry was restricted only to call on the delinquent-employee to offer his final explanation with regard to the claim made by him through the several letters in the light of the available certificates submitted by him. On behalf of the Union it is stated that in as much as the enquiry conducted by the Management involved only cross-examination of the concerned employee himself, the rules of procedure laid down in paragraph 13.4 of Sri T. L. Venkatarama Aiyar's Award is vitiated. But a closer scrutiny of this paragraph of this Aiyar award (copy of the Award has been placed before this Tribunal by the Union for perusal) it can be gathered that any enquiry must be conducted in accordance with the rules of natural justice and what those rules are had been laid down by the Supreme Court in a number of decisions. The law as laid down by the Supreme Court at that juncture has been extracted and the Award makes it clear that any order passed in the violation of the rules laid down by the Supreme Court would be illegal and therefore it is unnecessary to give any specific directions in this behalf. It is true that the Management has not examined any witness apart from seeking the clarification from the charge-sheeted employee. The employee also did not examine any witness on his side. The short question for appreciation would be whether in the given facts the domestic enquiry so held can be considered to be in violation of any known principles of natural justice. I am convinced that the reply has to be answered in the negative. What the Management has done is simply this: While the employee came forward to make a claim for leave fare concession his claim was scrutinised by the Management and on such examination certain doubts arose and the employee was called upon to offer his remarks and in the light of his explanation and the supporting documents the domestic enquiry was restricted to those materials alone. By no stretch of imagination can it be said that this domestic enquiry is violative of any principles of natural justice. It should also be noted that the charge-sheeted employee had the assistance of a representative of the Union during the enquiry. The Enquiry Officer conducted the examination of the employee. Merely because the Enquiry Officer called on the employee to offer his final explanation with regard to the claim made by the employee earlier it would be incorrect to say that the case of the Management totally rests only on the cross-examination of the charge-sheeted employee. After the domestic enquiry was over, the charge-sheeted workman was given a oral enquiry and the proceedings had been recorded. Thereafter the findings were submitted to



the competent authority who had taken all factors into consideration and rendered the finding. Even in the finding, the tentative penalty to be imposed is indicated and thereafter the employee was asked to offer his explanation with regard to the penalty proposed. The employee has in fact made his representation assisted by the representative of the trade union. After the final order was passed by the competent authority the employee preferred appeal to the Appellate Authority as enjoined in the Staff Regulation Rules. The Deputy Governor, Reserve Bank of India, Bombay has considered the claim of the employee and has eventually rejected it. On a consideration of these several factors and in the peculiar circumstances of the case I have no hesitation to find that the domestic enquiry held is fair and proper.

(4) That leads me to the consideration of the next question as to whether the findings of the competent authority as confirmed by the competent appellate authority are perverse. Admittedly, as there is no termination of service of the employee as such Section 11A of the Industrial Disputes Act cannot be invoked and therefore the jurisdiction of this Tribunal is extremely limited and cannot function as an Appellate Court. However, the Supreme Court in the decision reported in 1958—1—L.L.J.—page 260 (Indian Iron and Steel Company Limited and another vs. their workmen) a case which arose even prior to the introduction of Section 11A of the Industrial Disputes Act the Supreme Court has held that the Tribunal can interfere with the findings of the domestic enquiry officer on the following grounds:

- (i) when there is a want of good faith,
- (ii) when there is victimisation or unfair labour practice,
- (iii) when the management has been guilty of a basic error or violation of a principle of natural justice, and
- (iv) when on the materials the finding is completely baseless or perverse.

The Union which is espousing the cause of the charge-sheeted employee Sri S. Ponnuswamy maintains that there is want of good faith on the part of the Respondent-Management, in that, the Respondent-Bank has discriminated this employee alone whereas in similar instances relating to 31 employees, the Bank either did not take any disciplinary action or let them off with a warning. At this juncture, it will be pertinent for me to set out the previous history of the charge-sheeted employee. As on date, the employee has put in about 20 years of service under the Respondent-Bank. In August 1975, the employee claimed the leave fare concession and that was the first time during his 17 years of service to have made such a claim. It may also be noted that this claim was made only on behalf of the employee not on behalf of the family also. The employee did not at all obtain any advance against leave fare concession and as I have earlier pointed out as against the claim of Rs. 411.40 made by the employee the office of the Reserve Bank of India as seen from Ex. M-14 has made a note that the amount admissible would only be Rs. 370. Even this sum of Rs. 370 has not been paid to the employee. Ex. W-4 is a list of cases shows that the Respondent-Bank had almost ignored or winked at similar discrepancies committed by about 31 employees at or about the same time. It may be noted that in most of the cases the amounts had been drawn as advance, the highest amount being Rs. 1,600. The persons concerned are in the Class of the present charge-sheeted employee. There are also cases where some of the employees for huge amounts claimed as leave fare concession had been let off with a warning that the Bank would be constrained to take serious view of any such lapse in future. These facts are not at all disputed by the Management but on the other hand, at page 20 of the counter statement filed by the Respondent-Management, the Respondent-Management has stated that so far as the Madras Office is concerned, the Manager was satisfied that 39 false claims were made but no action was taken by the Bank in view of the difficulties in establishing the charges and therefore the Bank merely rejected the claims and recovered the advance paid. At page 4 of the counter statement, it is further claimed that this position was accepted by the employees concerned, conceding that the claims made were false. Even in the face of such acceptance by the employees that false claim had been made to huge extent they were let off almost without anything

The case of the present charge-sheeted employee Sri S. Ponnuswamy stands on the same footing. He is sought to be condemned and found guilty only on his statements and explanations. Hence when big fishes are let off almost on identical basis there is considerable force in the submission of the learned counsel for the Union Thiru Chandru that the action of the Management against the charge-sheeted employee is far from bona fide. In this context the grievance of the employee is that the respondent-Management had not taken into account the unblemished record of service put in by the workman for the last 18 years. In paragraph (2) of the claim statement also it is specifically claimed that the employee's entire record of service for more than 18 years service was an unblemished one. The stand of the Management with regard to this claim is significant at page 16 of the counter statement dealing with this claim of the employee and all that the Management would say is as follows:

"It is not admitted that the record of service of Shri Ponnuswamy was unblemished one."

Apart from this contention, not a scrap of paper has been placed by the responsible Management to throw doubt on the version of Sri S. Ponnuswamy that his record of service till date is without any blemish. As I have already pointed out in all his long service he had never availed of leave concession fare either to himself or to the members of his family at any point of time prior to this claim. If these factors are taken into consideration, a plausible conclusion could be that the charge-sheeted employee Sri S. Ponnuswamy has been discriminated by the Management.

(5) In paragraph (8) of the claim statement it is mentioned that the appeal provided for under Staff Regulation 49 preferred by the charge-sheeted employee sent through proper channel was vindictively withheld by the Bank. Ex. M-12 is the appeal preferred by the employee against the order passed by the competent authority. It is dated 4-4-1977. Ex. W-2 is the order of the Manager (it may be noted that the Manager is the competent authority who had given the finding and passed the sentence) whereby the appeal submitted by the employee had been withheld. No doubt the final order of the competent authority has been passed on 5-10-1976 under Ex. M-11 and the appeal has been preferred on 5-4-1977, just on the last date of the six months time provided under Regulation 50 of the Reserve Bank of India (Staff) Regulations, 1948. Although Ex. M-11 has been signed by the Manager on 5-10-1976 there is no clear date to show the date on which it was served on the employee. On the other hand, from Ex. W-1, it can be noted that although the order is dated 5-10-1976 the final order has been communicated to Sri S. Ponnuswamy through Deputy Chief Officer, Agricultural Credit Department, Reserve Bank of India, Madras-1 by an endorsement dated 6-10-1976. Therefore it is obvious that the appeal preferred by the employee has been filed within the time allowed by the Staff Regulation and not for obvious reason the Manager who is also the competent authority purports to withhold the appeal under Ex. W-2. It should also be remembered that this belated order in Ex. W-2 has been passed only on 9-6-1977. Immediately thereafter the Reserve Bank of India Employees' Association took up this issue with the Governor, Reserve Bank of India, Central Office, Bombay-1 on 11-6-1977 stating that the withholding of the appeal preferred by the employee is unfair labour practice. In Ex. W-3, it is claimed that Sri S. Ponnuswamy belongs to Scheduled Caste and as such caste prejudice has also weighed with Officer-in-charge. A perusal of Ex. W-3 would indicate that it is not unlikely that with ulterior purpose and misusing his position the Officer-in-charge has withheld the appeal preferred by the employee and thus scuttled the vested right of the aggrieved employee. After the issue was taken up by the Trade Union with the Governor, Reserve Bank of India, Bombay, the Governor has acted on the same and passed orders on 1-11-1977 under Ex. M-13. Therefore, although eventually the Appellate Authority has been forced by the assertion of right by the Labour Union to pass the order, the facts set out so far would easily justify the claim of the Union that an unfair labour practice has been adopted by the Manager in withholding the appeal preferred by the employee within the stipulated time and but for the prompt and effective action taken by the Union the memorandum of appeal preferred by the employee would not have been considered by the Governor, the appellate authority. Hence there is room to accept the submission that the Management has adopted unfair labour practice with regard to the charge-sheeted employee.

(6) It remains to be seen is whether the Management has been guilty of a basic error or violation of principles of natural justice. For the purpose of further discussion under this point it is presumed that in the domestic enquiry held the charge-sheeted employee has been found guilty of misconduct as contemplated under Regulation 47 of the Reserve Bank of India (Staff) Regulations, 1948 which in turn has been marked as Ex. W-6. According to the Management, the misconduct on the part of the charge-sheeted employee was that he has fraudulently presented a false leave fare concession bill. Regulation 72 of Ex. W-6 deals with leave and retirement fare concessions admissible to the staff in accordance with the provisions of Appendix IV. Clause (4) of Appendix IV enumerates conditions for the eligibility of the leave fare concession as mentioned in paragraph I(1) or I(2) of Appendix IV. It will thus be seen that before a leave fare concession is allowed to a staff, three conditions have to be satisfied. They are :

- (i) the employee has completed one year's service including continuous temporary service,
- (ii) the period of leave availed of is not less than fifteen days, and
- (iii) the employee certifies that the concerned journey was actually performed and the expenditure in question incurred.

It is not sufficient if only one of the two conditions is satisfied but in order to become eligible to claim the leave fare concession these two conditions have to be fulfilled. With regard to the first condition, the claimant-employee has put in more than 17 years of service on the date of claim, namely, 19-8-1975 and therefore the first condition is satisfied. The next condition to be satisfied by the claimant-employee would be that the period of leave availed of is not less than 15 days. In other words, if the claim related only during the period of leave of 15 days and less, then certainly the claimant will not be entitled to this leave fare concession. The charge-sheeted employee Sri S. Ponnuswamy was granted ordinary leave for a period of 15 days from 30th July, 1975 to 13th August, 1975 and that according to the claim under Ex. M-14 the journey has been performed within this period in between 1st August, 1975 to 6th August, 1975. But the point that has been totally lost sight of by the Management throughout is that in the instant case in as much as the employee was on ordinary leave for only 15 days he will not be entitled to claim leave fare concession in view of the Condition (ii) laid down in Clause (4) of Appendix IV relating to leave fare concessions. The various kinds of leave to which the employee would be entitled is laid down in Regulation 75. In particular, Regulations 85 to 89 deal with ordinary leave. Therefore when the employee has been granted ordinary leave only for 15 days and during which time he claims to have performed the journey he will not be entitled to claim this concession because during the period during which he claims to have performed the journey he was not on leave for not less than 15 days. Therefore when on the admitted materials the employee is not entitled to the claim, there is no need at all for the Management to go into the 3rd condition of eligibility with regard to details relating to journey actually performed and the expenditure incurred. Thus the entire proceedings lasting for over 4 years could have been easily avoided if only the Management had taken into consideration Condition No. (ii) in Clause (4) of Appendix IV of the Staff Regulation Ex. M-6. It should be distinctly remembered that only when conditions (i) and (ii) are satisfied the claimant-employee would be held to be entitled to the leave fare concession under the Staff Regulation. Once only when condition (i) and (ii) are satisfied the Management has to go into the question about the journey actually performed and the expenditure incurred by the claimant. In the circumstances, the Management has been guilty of an apparent basic error in the light of the specific rules of the Staff Regulations Ex. W-6. If that be so, then also any order flowing therefrom is liable to be interfered with by this Tribunal in the light of the guideline laid down by Supreme Court referred to earlier.

(7) Finally, it has to be considered whether the finding is completely baseless or perverse. Ex. M-14 is the copy of the leave fare concession bill presented by the employee on 19-8-1975. In column (4) it has been clearly mentioned that ordinary leave has been granted for 15 days from 30-7-1975 to 13-8-1975. The places had been visited under 2416 Kms.

Scheme. The claimant claimed Rs. 411.40 whereas even according to the Management he would only be entitled to Rs. 370. The claim of the employee was supported by the Certificate from the Taxi man, copy of which is marked as Ex. M-16. In short, the case of the Management is that it is a false claim made by the employee and that he could not have performed the journey as claimed by him. The explanation of the charge-sheeted employee is that he had started from Madras on 1-8-1975 visited Tiruchendur to offer a long pending vow to the Presiding Deity in spite of his bad health and from there he proceeded to Kanyakumari and Trivandrum, where he developed high temperature and therefore he has returned back to Madras on 4th morning at 10.00 A.M. The Enquiry Officer's finding is Ex. M-6 dated 10-7-1976. At page (6) of Ex. M-6 the Enquiry Officer says that "While it is possible for a person to perform a journey in a fit of religious fervour while being seriously ill, the deposition by the employee in respect of his leave letter dated 2nd August, 1975 casts some doubt as to whether he performed the journey at all." Therefore even the Enquiry Officer perfectly conscious that although the employee was suffering from fever he could have undertaken this long journey in order to fulfil a vow taken by him to the Presiding Deity of Tiruchendur, Tirunelveli District. There is no specific finding by the Enquiry Officer that the journey was not at all performed by the employee. When the employee is sought to be condemned on his own explanation his explanation has to be appreciated broadly, specially when there is not an iota of evidence other than the materials furnished by him. It should also be remembered that even under Ex. M-17 the employee has applied for 15 days ordinary leave from 30-7-1975 to 13-8-1975 stating that he is suffering from fever. Great strength is sought to be had from the medical certificate issued to the employee by Registered Medical Practitioner on 14-8-1975, copy of which is marked as Ex. M-20. From this, it may be stated that the employee was under his treatment for 5 days from 30-7-1975 upto 3-8-1975. Two things have to be appreciated with regard to this certificate. This certificate is produced by the claimant himself. If really that certificate was a bogus one he would not have dare to produce that certificate from a private Medical Practitioner which will be against his interest and cutting at the root of his claim to have left Madras on 1-8-1975. His explanation is no doubt that he was under treatment but was not necessarily under his daily treatment. It is not improbable that his case is true. After all it was only a case of fever and he wanted to undertake a tour to Tiruchendur to perform his vow to the Presiding Deity. As I have earlier pointed out in all 17 years of his service he has ever claimed this leave fare concession either for himself or the member of his family. He has also paid Rs. 411.40 being his share of the trip to Trivandrum and other places. In the light of these materials, it cannot be positively held that the claimant was in Madras and did not leave Madras on 1-8-1975 as claimed by him. The production of this certificate by the employee himself goes a long way to dispel any idea of false claim made against the Management. If however, even after the explanation offered by the claimant-employee that despite his fever and his treatment under the Medical Officer he had left Madras on 1-8-1975, the Management was not satisfied nothing had prevented the Management to have examined the aforesaid Medical Officer at the enquiry itself to establish the fact that the claimant was in actual treatment under him till 3-8-1975 which evidence would belie the case of the claimant that he had left Madras on 1-8-1975 despite his illness. For obvious reasons the Management had not chosen to adopt this course. Incidentally I may point out to the stand of the Management taken in paragraph 4(d) of the counter statement at page 16 that in case this Tribunal holds that the enquiry in the present case held by the Bank was not properly held the Bank may be given opportunity to lead evidence to establish the misconduct of the employee and in support of the charges framed against the employee. The position of law with regard to the Management's offering to lead evidence is well settled. Either the Management can entirely depend on the domestic enquiry proceedings and if the Tribunal comes to a conclusion that the enquiry was not properly held then the Management can call on the Tribunal to grant additional opportunity support the charges levelled by the Management. Secondly, even though the domestic enquiry has been held and the Management had accepted the findings of the domestic Enquiry Officer yet it is open to the Management to call on the Tribunal to permit the Management to adduce evidence straight away either in addition to the domestic enquiry proceedings or in spite of the domestic enquiry proceedings. It should be noted that in the present case the stand of the Management

would come only within the first category and therefore when the Management is rest content with the domestic enquiry proceedings and this has been held to be fair and proper by this Tribunal the materials appearing in the evidence on record alone have to be appreciated by this Tribunal. Therefore I am constrained to observe that the non-examination of the Medical Officer at the domestic enquiry who had issued the certificate Ex. M-20 would only probalilise the explanation of the charge-sheeted employee that he had left Madras on 1-8-1975 although he was suffering from fever.

(8) Another strong circumstance relied on by the Enquiry Officer is that the employee's claim is that he has reached back to Madras at 10.00 A.M. on 4-8-1975 whereas the Certificate of the taxi man, copy of which is marked as Ex. M-16 shows that the commencement of journey was 1st August, 1975 and the date of return is 6th August, 1975. The employee's explanation is that after reaching Tiruchendur offering worship at the deity and performing his vow to the presiding deity he was seriously ill and it worsened very much when he reached Trivandrum and therefore he abandoned that taxi and took other mode to reach Madras at the earliest. This explanation is supported by the certificate given by the taxi man which is marked as Ex. M-4, but the bill has been prepared as though the journey was completed on 6-9-1975. But that is understandable because that relates to entire party reaching Madras. The employee's claim is that he became too ill and therefore started on the night of 3rd August, 1975 at 7.00 P.M. from Trivandrum and he had reached Madras at 10.00 A.M. on the next day by means of another taxi for which he has shared and paid Rs. 45. Therefore there must have been some compelling reason for the employee to have dashed back to Madras. Taking into consideration the worsening condition of the employee it is not impossible for him to have reached Madras at 10.00 A.M. on 4th August, 1975. Another significant circumstance to give a lie circumstantial that the conduct of the employee is dishonest, is the fact that on 4-8-1975 he had presented himself before the Medical Officer of the Management-Company and he has certified that the employee is suffering from Pyrexia recommending 4 days leave from 4-8-1975 to 7-8-1975 inclusive. If really the claim of the employee is false, he would not have presented himself of his own accord before the Company's Medical Officer on 4-8-1975 and get himself treated by him. It is no doubt true that on a first glance, it may appear that the claim of the employee to have left Madras on 1-8-1975 and returned to Madras on 6-8-1975 may appear to be doubtful, but on a closer scrutiny it will be noticed that this claim is made only in the light of the certificate issued by the taxi which had carried other passengers also. Rs. 414 only relates to the share of the claimant among the other passengers who make the trip. At the best, all that can be held to have proved against the employee is that he had not correctly set out the facts at certain stages. That by itself would not amount to any misconduct as such in the light of the explanations offered by the employee. I have already pointed out how the conduct of the employee in having produced the medical certificate shows only bona fides and dispels any dishonesty on his part. It should also be remembered that even as early as 8-9-1975 under Ex. M-22, the employee has pointed out that in case the contents of the bill presented by him do not satisfy Deputy Chief Officer, Agricultural Credit Department, Reserve Bank of India, Madras-1 the prayed that this may be treated as cancelled. He has not availed leave fare concession facility throughout his career. He has not obtained any advance from the Bank. Another distinctive feature that emerges from the statement of the employee which is primary evidence and the Certificate produced by him under the original of Exs. M-16 and M-4 is the hard reality that the charge-sheeted employee has in fact parted with a sum of Rs. 414.40 towards the journey performed by him and this amount has been received from the Jal Cabs, Government Authorised Tourist Car Operators, Madras-83 and it is on the basis of Ex. M-16 the claimant-employee has presented his leave fare concession claim. If in fact the employee did not make the journey and did not part with Rs. 414 or even a single paise and wanted to make a wrongful gain of Rs. 414 for the Management it could have been easily achieved if only he had just made the claim supported by Ex. M-16 but withholding Exs. M-19 and M-20 and the benignant Management would have readily obliged him

without much a do whatsoever. Taking an overall picture of all these facts it is impossible to find that on the available materials that the charge-sheeted employee Sri S. Ponnuswamy had made a false leave fare concession claim from the Respondent-Management. Hence the finding that the employee is guilty of misconduct must be held to be perverse.

(9) Learned counsel for the Union Thiru Chandru eventually contends that even if the Tribunal does not agree with him that the findings of the Enquiry Officer are perverse or based on no evidence, yet this Tribunal can see that the punishment imposed by the Respondent-Bank is too severe and shockingly disproportionate to the gravity of offence alleged to have been committed by him. The penalty imposed on the charge-sheeted employee has been extracted by me earlier. For an amount claimed, viz., Rs. 411.40 but which according to verification by the office of the Respondent-Bank the employee would only be entitled to Rs. 370 and which has been paid to the employee nor any advance, the punishment imposed by the Bank would be that the employee is losing every month a sum of Rs. 245.60 and he has lost about Rs. 14,000 and odd. I had also pointed out in several cases bigger fishes had been let off by the Management. But the learned authority representative for the Respondent-Bank quite rightly points out that in as much as there is no question of any termination of service of the employee in the present reference, Section 11-A of the Industrial Disputes Act cannot be invoked by the employee to mitigate the rigour of the sentence imposed by the Management. But our High Court in 1974—I—L.L.J.—page 517 (Management of M/s. P. Orr and Sons (P) Ltd., vs. the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Madras and another) Honourable Justice Ismail as he then was has upheld the action of the Tribunal in having interfered with the question of sentence even prior to the introduction of Section 11-A of the Industrial Disputes Act on the ground of punishment being shockingly disproportionate to the gravity of the offence alleged to have been committed regard being had to the long years of service of the employee. In the present case also the record of the employee for 18 years is without blemish and throughout his career he had never availed leave fare concession claim either for him or for his members of the family and he has also never drawn any advance either. In order to fulfil his vow to the presiding deity he had undertaken the journey despite heavy odds. There is no want of bona fides on the part of the employee who hails from a backward and down trodden and economically weaker community. Therefore on the facts of the present case certainly this Tribunal can ever interfere with the severity of the sentence imposed on the employee. But in as much as I have found that the findings have to be vacated on all the four grounds enumerated by the Supreme Court in the citation referred to above it is unnecessary for me to interfere with the sentence imposed.

(10) In the result, an Award is passed setting aside the order passed by the Management against the employee Sri P. Ponnuswamy on 5-10-1976 under Ex. W-1. But in order to maintain cordial relationship between the Management and the Union which has sponsored the cause of the employee I direct the parties to bear their respective costs.

Dated, this 7th day of February, 1980.

T. SUNDARSANAM DANIEL, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-12012/19/78-D.II(A)]

S. K. BISWAS, Desk Officer.

#### WITNESSES EXAMINED

For both sides : None.

#### DOCUMENTS MARKED

For Workman

Ex. W-1/5-10-76—Order of penalty imposed on Thiru S. Ponnuswamy.

Ex. W-2/9-6-77—Letter from the Bank to the employee withholding the appeal.

Ex. W-3/11-6-77—Letter from the Union to the Governor of Reserve Bank of India requesting to review of the case of the employee.

- Ex. W-4—List of cases where the Bank has taken lenient view of the irregularity.
- Ex. W-5/30-1-78—Minutes of discussion held between the parties over the punishment imposed on Thiru S. Ponnuswamy.
- Ex. W-6—Reserve Bank of India (Staff) Regulations, 1948.

## For Management

- Ex. M-1/28-10-75—Show cause notice issued to the employee.
- Ex. M-2/1-11-75—Reply of the employee to Ex. M-1.
- Ex. M-3/23-1-76—Charge-sheet issued to the employee.
- Ex. M-4/18-2-76—Explanation of the employee to Ex. M-3.
- Ex. M-5/10-7-76—Enquiry proceedings.
- Ex. M-6/10-7-76—Finding of the Enquiry Officer.
- Ex. M-7/20-8-76—Findings of the Competent Authority proposing the penalty.
- Ex. M-8/21-8-76—Show cause notice proposing the punishment issued to the employee.
- Ex. M-9/6-9-76—Reply of the employee to Ex. M-8.
- Ex. M-10/18-9-76—Proceedings of the 2nd oral enquiry.
- Ex. M-11/5-10-76—Final order of the Competent Authority confirming the penalty.
- Ex. M-12/4-4-77—Appeal memorandum of the Employee to the Governor of Reserve Bank of India.
- Ex. M-13/1-11-77—Order of the Appellate Authority rejecting the appeal.
- Ex. M-14/19-8-75—Leave fare concession bill of the employee (Annexure-I of the counter statement).
- Ex. 15—Statement giving the details of journeys performed and cost of fare actually incurred (Annexure-II of the counter statement).
- Ex. M-16/7-8-75—Receipt of "Jai Cabs" for Rs. 411.40 bring the amount of Taxi-hire charge, (Annexure-III of the counter statement).
- Ex. M-17/2-8-75—Application of the employee for grant of ordinary leave. (Annexure IV of the counter statement).
- Ex. M-18/14-8-75—Application of the employee for grant of ordinary leave. (Annexure V of the counter statement).
- Ex. 19/4-8-75—Medical certificate issued to the employee. (Annexure VI of the counter statement).
- Ex. M-20/14-8-75—Medical certificate issued to the employee (Annexure VII of the counter statement).
- Ex. M-21/6-9-75—Memo issued to the employee calling for explanation. (Annexure VIII of the counter statement).
- Ex. M-22/8-9-75—Reply of the employee to Ex. M-21 (Annexure IX of the Counter Statement).
- Ex. M-23—Letter of the "Jai Cabs" Tourist Car Operators. (Annexure XIV of the Counter Statement).

T. SUNDARSANAM DANIEL, Industrial Tribunal

Note : Parties are directed to take return of their document(s) within six months from the date of the Award.

नई दिल्ली, 21 फरवरी, 1980

का० प्र० 554.—राष्ट्रपति, मूल नियम के नियम 45 के उपबंधों के अनुसरण में, कारखाना सलाह सेवा और श्रम संस्थान महाविदेशालय के

प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन सरकारी निवास स्थान आबंटन नियम, 1973 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाने हैं, अर्थात्:—

1. (1) इन नियमों का नाम कारखाना सलाह सेवा और श्रम संस्थान महाविदेशालय के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन सरकारी निवास स्थान आबंटन (संशोधन) नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. कारखाना सलाह सेवा और श्रम संस्थान महाविदेशालय के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन सरकारी निवास स्थान आबंटन नियम, 1973 में,—

(क) नियमों में,—

(1) "टाइप 1, टाइप 2, टाइप 3 या 4" शब्दों और अंकों के स्थान पर, जहाँ कहीं भी वे आए हैं, क्रमशः "टाइप क, टाइप ख, टाइप ग या टाइप घ" शब्द और अक्षर रखे जाएंगे;

(2) "टाइप 5 और 6" शब्द और अंकों के स्थान पर, जहाँ कहीं भी वे आए हैं, क्रमशः "टाइप ड और ड 1" शब्द, अक्षर और अंक रखे जाएंगे।

(ख) अनुसूचक नियम 317-म-4 के नीचे सागुनी के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित सागुनी रखी जाएगी, अर्थात्:—

निवास स्थान का अधिकारी को जिस आबंटन वर्ष में प्राप्ति किया टाइप आए, उसके प्रथम दिन को उसका प्रवर्ग या उसकी मासिक उपलब्धियाँ

क	260 रु० से कम
ख	500 रु० से कम, किन्तु 260 रु० से कम नहीं
ग	1000 रु० से कम, किन्तु 500 रु० से कम नहीं
घ	1500 रु० से कम, किन्तु 1000 रु० से कम नहीं।
ड	2000 रु० से कम, किन्तु 1500 रु० से कम नहीं।
ड 1	2000 रु० और उससे अधिक।

[का० सं० ए०-42011/41/79-कारखाना]  
जे० के० जैन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 21st February, 1980.

S.O. 554.—In pursuance of the provisions of rule 45 of the Fundamental Rules, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Allotment of Government Residences under the administrative control of the Directorate General of Factory Advice Service and Labour Institutes Rules, 1973, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Allotment of Government Residences under the administrative control of the Directorate General of Factory Advice Service and Labour Institutes (Amendment) Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Allotment of Government Residences under the administrative control of Directorate General of Factory Advice Service and Labour Institutes Rules, 1973,—

(a) throughout the rules :

(i) for the words and figures "type I, II, type III of IV" wherever they occur, the words and letters "type A, type B, type C or type D" shall respectively be substituted;

(ii) for the words and figures "type V and VI" wherever they occur, the words and letters "type E and E1" shall be respectively substituted.

(b) for the Table below S.R. 317-Y-4, the following Table shall be substituted, namely: -

Type of residence	Category of officer or his monthly emoluments as on the first day of the allotment year in which the allotment is made.
A	Less than Rs. 260/-.
B	Less than Rs. 500/-, but not less than Rs. 260/-.
C	Less than Rs. 1000/-, but not less than Rs. 500/-.
D	Less than Rs. 1500/-, but not less than Rs. 1000/-.
E	Less than Rs. 2000/-, but not less than Rs. 1500/-.
E.1	Rs. 2000/- and above.

[F. No. A-42011/41/79-Fac.]

J. K. JAIN, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 21st February, 1980

**S.O. 535.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers, in relation to the management of Kujama Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Kujama, District Dhanbad and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 18th February, 1980.

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

**Reference No. 67 of 1977**

(Ministry's Order No. L-20012/11/76/DHIA, dated, 29-9-76)

#### PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Kujama Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O. Jharia, District Dhanbad.

#### AND

Their Workmen,

#### PRESENT:

Mr. Justice B. K. Ray (Retd.) Presiding Officer.

#### APPEARANCES:

For the Management—Shri G. Prasad, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri H. N. Singh, Vice-President, Koyala Ispat Mazdoor Panchayat.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal

Dhanbad, the 13th February, 1980

#### AWARD

As many as six workmen of Kujama Colliery belonging to Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited were charged by the management for gross negligence of duty amounting to misconduct under Standing Orders of the employer and they were asked to show cause within 48 hours from the date of receipt of the charge to show cause as to why disciplinary action should not be taken against them. The management not being satisfied with the show cause filed by the workmen, a domestic enquiry was held regarding the charges. As per report of the officer conducting the domestic enquiry except Jokhan Passi and Jahangir Bhar, the workmen concerned in the present ref-

erence the remaining four who had been charged were exonerated. Jokhan Passi made a representation to the management against the findings regarding him in the domestic enquiry. That representation was allowed and he reinstated in service. On the basis of the report in the domestic enquiry, Jahangir Bhar was dismissed from service with effect from 21-12-1974. On the order of dismissal Jahangir Bhar raised a dispute which led to a Conciliation Proceeding. The Conciliation Proceeding having ended in failure the appropriate Government made a reference for adjudication of the dispute raised by Jahangir Bhar in the following terms:

"Whether the action of the management of Kujama Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jharia (District Dhanbad) in dismissing Shri Jahangir Bhar, Night Guard from duty with effect from 21st December, 1974 is justified. If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

2. After the reference was received in this Tribunal parties were noticed. They filed their written statements and documents. The management in its written statement challenged the validity of the reference and the jurisdiction of the Tribunal to entertain the reference on the grounds that the President had no material before him for making the reference, and that in any case, the Desk Officer could not have made a reference and that the reference was not duly authenticated. A further plea taken by the management alternatively was that Jahangir Bhar having been posted in the office which did not fall under the definition of mine the appropriate Government was not the Central Government and so the Tribunal had no jurisdiction to deal with the dispute. These points were taken for the consideration by my predecessor as Preliminary Points. My learned predecessor by order dated 30th November, 1978 held that the Desk Officer was competent to make the reference that the reference was proper and that the Central Government was the appropriate Government to make the reference. But in the concluding portion of the order my learned predecessor held that there was perversity in the finding of the officer conducting the domestic enquiry. On account of this observation at the time of hearing of the reference case management was permitted to lead evidence to establish the charge levelled against the workmen. In support of its case management examined as many as three witnesses and on behalf of the union only one witness was examined. The evidence of MW-1 is not dealt with here as the same had been considered by my predecessor while deciding the Preliminary Points. That apart that evidence does not touch the merit of case against the workmen.

3. As has been indicated above the charge against the workmen was one of gross negligence of duty which amounted to misconduct under Standing Orders. The case against the workmen was that he was on duty as a Night Guard at the South Kujama Colliery Stores in the night of 16/17th September, 1974 and while he was on duty a theft occurred in the store by breaking open the locks affixed to the outer and inner doors of the store rooms. MW-1 is the Officer who conducted the enquiry. According to him as many as six workers were charge-sheeted for gross negligence of duty amounting to misconduct under Standing Orders relating to the above workmen. The report of MW-1, Ext. M-14 shows that only two of the six workmen charged namely Jokhan Passi and Jahangir Bhar were found to be guilty. On the basis of the report the four workmen not found guilty were exonerated. Jokhan Passi, however, as mentioned above filed a representation before the management against the findings against him. The management accepted the representation, exonerated him of the charge and reinstated him in service. But so far as Jahangir Bhar was concerned, the management acted upon the findings against him in the domestic enquiry and removed him from service which led to the present reference.

4. So far as the merit of the case against the present workman is concerned, the following points arise for determination, namely, (a) whether there was alleged theft from the store as claimed by the management, (b) conceding that there was a theft from the store room whether at the time the theft took place Jahangir Bhar was on duty as night guard at the store.

M.W. 2 is the Store Keeper who was posted in Kujama Colliery as Store Keeper in the year 1974. He claimed that when he was in charge of the store in the night of 16/17-9-1974 there was a theft from it. On 16-9-74 he was on duty

from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. and during that period of his stay there was no theft. When he left on 16-9-74 at 5 p.m. he locked up the store properly. Hinges with lock and altraps fixed to the doors were alight when he left the store at 5 p.m. on 16-9-74. Next day i.e. 17-9-74 at 8 a.m. when he came to the store on duty he found the screws fixed to the altraps removed. He also found the doors of the outer store room opened. He immediately did not enter into the store but informed about the incident to two persons, namely, Shri K. A. Khan and Shri N. S. Tiwary who were standing thereby. Mr. Khan was the Asstt. Manager of Kuia Colliery and Mr. Tiwary was the Asstt. Manager of Kujama Colliery at that time. When the store keeper informed these two persons about the breaking open of the locks of the outer room of the store those two persons asked him (Store Keeper) to inform the security staff and the Manager. Being told like that the Store Keeper informed the Manager Sri L. N. Dubey. Mr. Dubey on being informed by the Store Keeper came to the Store room alongwith Store Keeper. Both of them entered the store rooms. On entering the first room of the store they found that the lock affixed to the inner room of the store had also been broken. Both of them found that articles mentioned in Ext. M-18 were missing from the store. Two copies of the list of articles missing were prepared by the store keeper of whom one was given to the Sub Area Manager and other to the Security Officer. Thereafter an information was lodged before the police as per Ext. M-17. Upon this evidence it is claimed by the management that there was a theft of articles from the Store room as mentioned in Ext. M-18. M.W.2 further asserts that when he left duty at 5 p.m. on 16-9-74 Jokhan Passi had come to the store for duty as a night guard at 4 p.m. According to the Store Keeper Jokhan Passi was to be on duty from 4 p.m. to 12 O'clock night. It is further said by the store keeper that he joined duty at 8 a.m. on 17-9-74. In cross-examination M.W.2 admits that he joined as Store Keeper since 1966 and was working as such when the colliery was taken over by the Government on 17-10-1976. M.W.2 says that when Government took over charge no officer on behalf of the Government looked into the registers of articles maintained in the store nor there was any physical verification of the articles in it. The witness further says that within a day or two after the Government took over charge there was physical verification without an endorsement to that effect in the registers maintained in the store. This evidence is very difficult to accept. The evidence of M.W.2 further reveals that the articles alleged to have been stolen were some items in the register of old machineries Ext. M-16. If the evidence of M.W.2 that there was physical verification without endorsement on the register is disbelieved the inference is that at least from 17-1-1971 there was no stock verification of articles inside the store with reference to the registers maintained therein. M.W.2 further admits in cross-examination that he was issuing articles from the store on the verbal orders of the Manager and was not mentioning these orders in the register of articles maintained in the store while issuing articles. The articles alleged to have been stolen are as already stated some items of old articles. M.W.2 categorically admits in cross-examination that there was no physical verification of old articles in 1974. Unless the articles alleged to have been stolen are proved to be in existence in the store before the alleged occurrence of theft, it is very difficult to accept a case of theft on the basis of a list of articles prepared by M.W.2 with reference to the entries in the old register. The list would not show that the articles mentioned in it were actually stolen in the night of occurrence as claimed by management without any evidence that they were in the store just before the occurrence. The management in order to establish a case of theft of the articles in the store must have led evidence to show that the articles alleged to have been stolen were there inside the store room before the occurrence took place. In the present case as has been found out there has been no physical verification of old machineries since after the Government took over in 1971. The evidence of M.W.2 reveals that he issues articles on the verbal orders of the Manager without making any mention of the orders in the registers while issuing articles from the store. In the circumstances it is very difficult to agree with the management that the articles alleged to have been stolen as per the list prepared by M.W.2 were actually inside the inner room of the store before the occurrence took place and that they were stolen in the night of occurrence.

Evidence of M.W.3 is also of no assistance to the management on the question as to whether the alleged theft took place from the store in the night of occurrence. His evidence

discloses that before January, 1974 one Sri R. D. Passi was the Manager of the colliery. M.W.3 took over charge from him. The witness categorically admits that after he took over charge he did not make any physical verification of the articles inside the store. The evidence on the point is as follows :

"I did not make any physical verification in the store between the date I took over charge and the date of the alleged occurrence nor I caused any physical verification to be made by anybody else." The evidence even goes further to say that the list of articles alleged to have been stolen prepared by M.W.2 was not verified by the witness. The witness admits that he made no attempt to find out if the articles alleged to have been stolen were in fact before the Store Keeper left the store on 16-9-74.

On the point as to whether the alleged theft of articles occurred from the store in question, on the evidence of both the manager as well as the Store Keeper it must be said that the management has failed to establish its case of theft. Point (a) is thus decided against the management.

Assuming but not conceding that there was a theft the next question which arises for consideration is as to whether at the time when the theft is alleged to have taken place the workman concerned was the Night Guard on duty at the Store. The duty chart Ext. M-19 shows that two persons namely Jokhan Passi and Jahangir Bhar who is the workman concerned in the case were on duty at the store from 10 p.m. to 6 a.m. In face of this document management seeks to establish that Jokhan Passi who was one of the workman originally charged but subsequently exonerated was on duty from 4 p.m. to 12 mid night. This is sought to be established through oral evidence of both the Manager as well as the Store Keeper. But in view of the documentary evidence showing that both Jokhan Passi and Jahangir Bhar were on duty from 10 p.m. to 6 p.m. the oral evidence to the contrary cannot be accepted. Jokhan Passi has been exonerated on the ground that during his period there was no theft but if the period when Jokhan Passi was on duty is taken to be the same when Jahangir Bhar was on duty there can be no escape from the conclusion that there was no theft between 10 p.m. to 6 a.m. Theft if any therefore might have taken place between 6 a.m. to 8 a.m. when admittedly neither Jokhan Passi nor Jahangir Bhar was on duty. According to the management nobody was on duty between 6 a.m. to 8 a.m. An argument is advanced on behalf of the management by saying that between 6 a.m. to 8 a.m. it would be broad day light and so it would not be possible for anybody to commit a theft from inside the store after breaking the locks. This is a mere probability and it cannot be concluded that no theft did actually take place between 6 a.m. to 8 a.m. Further it is just possible that the Store Keeper might have himself loosened the screws and brought out the altraps with locks fixed to the doors of the store between 6 a.m. to 8 a.m. in order to make it appear as if there was a theft in order to save himself from any charge for missing articles in the store. Admittedly between 6 a.m. to 8 a.m. there was no guard on duty at the store.

M.W.3 Manager has deposed that it is the duty of the Havildar to see whether the Watchmen are on duty or not. The Havildar also checks the locks. The witness admits that he was to be informed by a Havildar relating to the occurrence. Havildar M.W.4 deposes that he was on duty from about 8.30 a.m. till about 5.30 p.m. or 6 p.m. in the evening on 16-9-79. By the time he left duty on 16-9-74 he did not check the locks attached to the store. The evidence of Havildar and of the Manager regarding the duties of a Havildar as deposed by him does not help the management at all. It is not known which Havildar was on duty on the night of occurrence. It is not known why he has not been produced. The Havildar M.W.4 was not on duty at the relevant time. He even goes to the extent of saying that he did not check the locks when he left the duty.

Before summing up the conclusion there is one point which requires to be dealt at this stage. As per Ext. M-19 the Duty Chart, both Jokhan Passi and Jahangir Bhar were on duty on the alleged night from 10 p.m. to 6 a.m. on the following morning. Jokhan Passi was one of the six workmen who had been originally charge-sheeted by the management for gross negligence. The Enquiry Officer in the domestic enquiry had found Jokhan Passi also guilty. Thereafter management exonerated Jokhan Passi and reinstated



him in his service. If both Jokhan Passi and Jahangir Bhar are taken to be on duty for the same period there is no justification for exonerating Jokhan Passi and holding the present workman concerned guilty. True the plea taken by Jokhan Passi before the Enquiry Officer and in his show cause was to the effect that he was on duty from 4 p.m. to 12 O' Clock at night. But such a plea could not have been accepted in view of the documentary evidence—namely Duty Chart Ext. M-19. If really Jokhan Passi was on duty from 4 p.m. to 12 O' Clock at night no attempt has been done by the management to show under what circumstances the Duty Chart Ext. M-19 shows something else. The Duty Chart is a document produced by the management and is relied upon by it. In the absence of anything to show that the same Chart does not represent the real state of things, it must be given its due weight and it must have preference over other oral evidence led by the parties. Even Jokhan Passi who has been exonerated by the management on the plea that he was on duty from 4 p.m. to 12 O' Clock at night has not been examined by the management in the case to show that he was not there at the store as a Night Guard after 12 O' Clock at night and that when he left the duty the locks of the store were in tact. On the aforesaid analysis the conclusion is irresistible that the management has failed to prove that Jahangir Bhar was on duty when the alleged theft took place. Point (b) therefore is decided against the management.

5. For the reasons given above I hold that the management has not been able to prove its case against the workman concerned. The order of dismissal of Jahangir Bhar is therefore liable to be vacated and Sri Jahangir Bhar is entitled to be reinstated with full back wages. He is also entitled to be deemed to be in continuous service from the date of his reinstatement without any break. The reference is answered accordingly.

B. K. RAY, Presiding Officer  
[No. L-20012/11/76-D.III(A)]

**S.O. 556.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award if the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Central Coal Washeries Organisation of Steel Authority of India Limited, At an Post Office Seraidhella (Dhanbad) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 19th February, 1980.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD**

Reference No. 29 of 1979

In the matter of an industrial dispute under S.10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

**PARTIES :**

Employers in relation to the management of Central Coal Washeries Organisation of Steel Authority of India Limited, At and Post office Seraidhella (Dhanbad).

AND

Their workmen.

**APPEARANCES :**

On behalf of the employers—Shri T. P. Choudhury, Advocate.

On behalf of the workman—Shri J. D. Lall, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, 11th February, 1980

**AWARD**

The reference has been made by the Central Government under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to this court for adjudication with the following schedule :

**SCHEDULE**

"Whether the action of the management of Central Coal Washeries Organisation, Steel Authority of India Limited, At and Post office Seraidhella (Dhanbad)

in not confirming/promoting Shri Jatadhar Lal on the ground that he had not passed departmental examination for the post of Accountant as prescribed in the company's circular letter No. HSL/CFD/61 dated the 18th April, 1961 is justified ? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled and from what date?"

The concerned workman Shri Jatadhar Lal was appointed an accountant by the Central Coal Washeries Organisation, Dhanbad in the pay scale of Rs. 200—15—380—20—500 on 27-2-62 and was posted in the head office of the Central Coal Washeries Organisation at Seraidhella (Dhanbad). Because of his past experience as accountant he was given two advance increments in the above mentioned pay scale. Prior to the above appointment the concerned workman had been working in the Fertilizer Corporation of India as accountant for about 8 years and in the Indian Oil Corporation, India, Barauni for one year. By educational qualification he is B. Com. The Central Coal Washeries Organisation was under the Hindustan Steel Ltd., a Government company with its registered office at Ranchi. The service conditions of the employees of Central Coal Washeries Organisation was governed by the service rules and regulations of the then Hindustan Steel Ltd. With effect from 1-5-1973 the Hindustan Steel Ltd. has been re-named as Steel Authority of India Ltd. with its registered office at Delhi. The Central Coal Washeries Organisation has a number of coal washeries plants including one each at Patharidih and in Dugdah. Besides the concerned workman, Shri P.V. Venkatasahan was appointed as Accountant in the same pay scale in April, 1962 and one Shri Hari Charan Singh was appointed as accountant in the year 1963 and both were posted at the Central office of the organisation at Seraidhella at Dhanbad district. Through circular letter No. FA/CWP/AD(10)/3/62.1446 dated 4th July, 1962 the concerned workman was required to pass prescribed departmental examination during his probationary period as per rules of Hindustan Steel Ltd. He gave an immediate reply protesting against the direction to pass the departmental examination as he was not required to do so as per terms and conditions of his appointment under the organisation. He did not get any reply to his protest letter and he completed his probationary period of one year. Shri P. V. Venkatasahan who was junior to the concerned workman as accountant was promoted to the post of Assistant Accounts Officer in November, 1964 and Shri Hari Charan Singh was promoted in the post of Assistant Accounts Officer in October, 1965. The concerned workman made representations to the management against his unjustified supersession by Shri Venkatasahan and Shri Singh at the relevant times; but no reply was given to him by the management. The concerned workman feeling frustrated was compelled to file a Civil Suit in the Civil Court, Dhanbad and ultimately the litigation went up to the High Court at Patna. Their Lordships of the Patna High Court by their judgement dated 16-5-78 held that the civil court had no jurisdiction in the matter under litigation. During the course of litigation however, the concerned workman came to know that he had been superseded since 1964 onwards because he had not passed the departmental examination under the rules of Hindustan Steel Ltd. He procured the circular letter which is No. HSL/CFD/61 dated the 18th April, 1961. According to the workman the circular does not require that the accountant should pass the departmental examination for the promotion to the higher post. It only speaks of the departmental examination for confirmation of an accountant and that too in the case of those accountants in whose appointment letter there is an express condition that they would have to pass the departmental examination within a specified period. Since there was no such express condition in the appointment letter of the concerned workman he was not required to pass the departmental examination for his confirmation. His further case is that on completion of one year probationary period he has continued in the post of accountant as if he was confirmed on that post for otherwise he would have been discharged from service for failure of not having passed such departmental examination. The concerned workman, after dismissal of his case by High Court, made representation to the management through his union viz. Koyala Ispat Mazdoor Panchayat and then raised an industrial dispute before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) Dhanbad. The same plea as in the Civil suit was taken by the management before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) in their comments dated 16/19-10-1978 to the complaint dated 24-8-1978 of the union. The management

insisted that the concerned workman had to pass the departmental examination before promotion and would continue to be superseded by his juniors until he passed such departmental examination. The concerned workman has tried to pick hole in this stand of the management by saying that many accountants in the Steel Plant at Bhilai under the Hindustan Steel Ltd. who had not passed the departmental examination and who had similar academic qualification or less qualification had been promoted to the post of Assistant Accounts Officer in the year 1962 and 1965. He has referred to the D.O. letter No. Dy. P.M./CA/73/3119 dated 21st August, 1973 from Shri U.K. Choubey, Deputy Personnel Manager, Bhilai Steel Plant to Shri K. Prosad, C.C.W.O., Hindustan Steel Ltd., Dhanbad. On failure of the conciliation, the matter was referred to the Central Government whereafter this reference was made to this court.

The employers took the plea that the Central Government had no jurisdiction to make the reference and that the labour union which has sponsored the case of the concerned workman is not in existence in the Central Coal Washeries Organisation at Dhanbad. The reference was also said to be barred under the principles of res judicata. The appointment of the concerned workman was admitted by the employers through letter dated 6-7-62. He was required to pass the departmental examination. The contention raised by the concerned workman was not acceptable to the management. The concerned workman Shri Lal insisted that he was exempted from appearing the departmental examination; but this fact as not accepted by the management and it was made clear to him that if he could not pass he would not be confirmed and his services would be terminated. It was denied that on completion of probationary period the concerned workman was confirmed. Similarly he could not be promoted unless he passed the departmental examination. His further contention is that after a good deal of fruitless correspondence when Shri Lal realised that he was liable to pass the departmental examination, he applied for appearing for that examination. In such examination in the year 1967 he was accorded permission to appear in both parts but he could not appear on the ground of illness. Shri Lal however appeared in the accounts examination held in February, 1964, March, 1967 and March, 1971, and subsequently in October and November. But he could not pass the two parts inspite of repeated attempts. In November 1971 however he passed part II examination but failed to clear up in Part I examination. Under rules of the management there is no limitation to the number of chances to complete the other part if the candidate has completed one part within six chances. Since Shri Lal has cleared Part II within six chances. It was open for him to complete the other part in order to qualify to being confirmed as an accountant and to be eligible for getting promotion to the post of Assistant Accounts Officer. Before that Shri Lal could not be heard to say that he should have been confirmed or promoted. On the strength of the above statement the management's stand is that in not confirming or promoting Shri Lal before passing the departmental examination, the management is justified and therefore Shri Lal is not entitled to any relief whatsoever in the reference.

Briefly stating the case of the workman is that under the terms of his appointment as accountant, he should have been confirmed on completion of one year probation and the rule of the Hindustan Steel Ltd. to pass the departmental examination before confirmation was not applicable to this case. The management therefore was wrong in requiring him to pass departmental examination before confirming him and promoting to the post of Assistant Accounts Officer in the organisation. On the other hand, the management has however taken the view that by virtue of his appointment letter the concerned workman Shri Lal was not exempt from departmental examination. His stand was thoroughly examined by the management and rejected. In pursuance of the same Shri Lal cleared Part II examination and was still to clear Part I examination before he could be confirmed or promoted to higher rank. The main question to be decided in this reference is as to whether the concerned workman Shri Jatadhar Lal is required to pass the departmental examination before he could be confirmed on the post he was appointed as accountant, and consequently promoted to the post of Assistant Accounts Officer.

Quite a large number of documents have been filed by both sides and they have been admitted into evidence. I will deal with some of these documents which are relevant. Ext. W.1 is a letter of appointment dated 25-2-62 under which

Sri J. Lal the concerned workman was appointed as accountant in the Central Coal Washeries Organisation. It is an admitted position that he had previous experience in Sindri Fertilizer Corporation and in Indian Oil, Barauni as accountant and therefore on his initial appointment his pay was fixed in the scale with two advance increments considering his past experience. This letter of appointment does not require the concerned workman to pass any departmental examination. The period of probation was fixed at one year. But one letter Ext. W.2 dated 4-7-62 was issued to him under the signature of the Assistant Accounts Officer of the organisation to pass departmental examination. Shri Lal replied under his letter dated 6-7-62, Ext. W.3 that he was not liable to appear at examination in view of his letter of appointment. No reply was given to him. In 1964 one Shri Venkateshan, an accountant junior to Shri Lal was promoted to the post of Assistant Accounts Officer. Shri Lal sent a protest letter to his supersession, Ext. W.9 dated 20-12-64. No reply was given to him. Similarly, in 1965 Shri Hari Charan Singh still more junior to Shri Lal as accountant was promoted to the post of Asstt. Accounts Officer. Shri Lal again protested under his letter Ext. W.10. But he received no reply. Shri Lal thereafter sought redress in the Civil Court. The documents in this connection are Ext. W.6, which is a copy of the judgement of Hon'ble High Court at Patna. Ext. W.8 is Lower Appellate Court judgement. Ext. M4 is the judgement of the Munsif. It was held by the Hon'ble High Court that the Civil Court had no jurisdiction to entertain the matter under dispute. The concerned workman Shri Lal thereafter raised this industrial dispute through his union—Koyala Ispat Mazdoor Panchayat.

So far as the management is concerned the above position is admitted. The controversial document requiring interpretation by this Tribunal is Ext. M1 equivalent to Ext. W.5 dated 18-4-1961.

In support of his case the workman Shri Lal has examined himself as WW.1. He has put forth his case. On behalf of the management, MW.1 Shri Samar Sinha has been examined. He is at present Dy. Personnel Manager. In 1963 he was Assistant Personnel Manager in the Central Coal Washeries Organisation. According to his evidence he concerned workman had protested against being required to pass accounts examination. He has produced an extract from the promotion policy prepared by the head office. It is Ext. M5. He has also produced Ext. M6 which is Personal file of the concerned workman, Shri Jatadhar Lal. The other documents marked on admissions are the following—Ext. M1 is letter No. HSL/CFD/61 dated 18-4-1961 regarding departmental examination of accountants. Ext. M2 is letter No. Para 71(2)/64 dated 5th October, 1966 regarding deputation of accountants after training. Ext. M3 is seniority list of accountants in C.C.W.O. corrected upto 31-7-72.

There is nothing much to be said about the oral and documentary evidence in this case because all the other matters are admitted except this that according to the management Shri J. Lal could not be confirmed on his post or promoted to higher post unless he cleared up both parts in the accounts examination. Shri Lal, on the other hand, had insisted that by virtue of his appointment he was exempted from any such examination and also because the circular letter concerning departmental examination did not affect him in any manner. In this reference therefore, we are required to interpret the circular letter Ext. M1 (Ext. W.5) dated 18-4-61. For ready reference I am herewith re-producing this letter :—

#### "HINDUSTAN STEEL LIMITED, RANCHI.

No. HSL/CFD/61

Dated the 18th April, 1961

The General Manager, RSP/Rourkela

The General Manager/BSP/Bhilai

The General Manager/DSP/Durgapur

Sub :—Departmental examination for accountants.

The question of instituting departmental examination for promotion/confirmation as accountant has been under consideration for some time. The matter was discussed in the meeting of the PF & CAOs held at Ranchi on the 17th & 18th April 1961. It has, accordingly been decided that departmental examinations will be held every six months, the first examination being held in November, 1961. This examination will be open to such of the staff as have been appointed



as accountants on the express conditions that they would have to pass a departmental examination within a specified period. The examination will be open also to such of the other staff as has put in a minimum of 2 years' service in HSL in the scale of Rs. 80-220 or above. The staff holding M. Com. Degree will be allowed to take the examination after one year's service has been rendered in HSL. The examination will be held in two parts, vide syllabus attached.

The promotions/confirmations will be made on the basis of this examination as well as the interviews by the Departmental Promotion Committee of the Plants concerned which will take into account the Service Records, etc. of the staff. Kindly acknowledge receipt.

Yours faithfully,  
Sd/- M.C. Saria  
Chief, Finance Division."

I have stated earlier that Shri Jatadhar Lal was appointed through appointment letter dated 15-2-62 (Ext. W.1). He was therefore appointed after issuing of the circular letter, Ext. M1. The subject of the circular letter Ext. M1 describe— "departmental examination for accountants". In the opening line of the circular the object has been set. The object of the management says 'instituting departmental examination for promotion/confirmation as accountants'. On behalf of the workman it has been argued that it should be meant to include employees who are to be promoted to the post of accountant and to be confirmed in that post. What is meant is that persons below the rank of accountant were to take the departmental examination for the purpose of promotion as accountant and confirmation on that post. Then again this examination will be open to such of the staff as have been appointed as accountant on express conditions that they would have to pass the departmental examination within a specified period. Shri T.P. Choudhury appearing on behalf of the management has argued that according to the circular employees holding the post of accountant would have to pass the departmental examination before their promotion to superior post or before their confirmation on that post. The circular is not very happily worded; but this much is clear that it applies to persons below the rank of accountant in the matter of their promotion to the post of accountant. For for the purpose of promotion as accountant this circular was applicable but it is not clear whether it was to be limited to these people who have been promoted to the post of accountant from below or to those also who were directly appointed as accountants. But this circular makes it abundantly clear that "this examination will be open to such of the staff as have been appointed as accountants on the express conditions that they would have to pass a departmental examination within a specified period." If this circular is to be interpreted on its face value such persons who were appointed as accountants without any express condition that they would have to pass departmental examination within a specified period, could not be required to pass a departmental examination before confirmation. It comes to my mind whether this clause was intended to cover up those cases of accountants who were appointed before the circular was issued in 1961. But such an interpretation is not possible for the simple reason that when there was no system of departmental examination before the circular was issued there could be no condition incorporated in the appointment letters of accountants to pass a departmental examination within a specified period. It means that through this circular it was intended by the management that after the issue of the circular Ext. M1 only those accountants would be required to pass the departmental examination in whose appointment letter a necessary condition was incorporated to pass a departmental examination within a specified period. I am unable to give any other interpretation to the aforesaid clause of the circular. In the case of appointment letter of Shri Jatadhar Lal no such condition had been put in. It is an admitted position that for about 9 years Shri J. Lal had been working as accountant in Public Undertaking such as Sindri Fertilizer Corporation and Indian Oil Corporation, Barauni. He was further given two advance increments. The management perhaps was conscious of the fact that due to his past experience standing over several years he should not be required to pass any departmental examination. Since the circular had been issued nearly one year before his appointment I see no reason why such a term was not incorporated in his appointment letter if he was required to pass departmental examination before his confirmation.

Shri T. P. Choudhury, Advocate for the management has relied on Ext. W.2 which is the office copy of the letter No. FA/CWP/Ad(10)/3/62-1446 dated 4th July, 1962 signed by the Assistant Accounts Officer which reads as follows :

"HINDUSTAN STEEL LIMITED  
SERAIHELLA, P.O. DHANBAD.

No. FA/CWP/Adm(10)/3/62-1446

Dated July 4, 1962

Shri Jatadhar Lal,  
Accountant,  
Office of the Dy. Financial Adviser & Chief  
Accounts Officer,  
Coal Washery Project,  
Dhanbad.

In continuation of this office No. Accts/OW/Adm/08/4730 dated 15/17-2-62, I am to inform you that during the period of probation you are required to pass the prescribed departmental examination as per the rules of H.S.L.

Sd./-  
Asstt. Accounts Officer."

This letter is said to be in continuation of the appointment letter issued to Shri Jatadhar Lal requiring him to pass the prescribed departmental examination. The question is whether this letter could be said to be a part and parcel of the appointment letter issued to Shri J. Lal. The appointment letter Ext. W.1 had been signed by the Dy. Financial Adviser & Chief Accounts Officer fully incorporating the terms and conditions of appointment. The letter Ext. W.2 cannot be said to be part and parcel of that appointment letter. Ext. W.1 could be at best said to be a follow up action based on the appointment letter Ext. W.1. But for a follow up action it is necessary that the action must naturally flow from the letter of appointment. By this I mean that if any terms and conditions for passing the departmental examination was incorporation therein, the Asstt. Accounts Officer could have based his action under Ext. W.2 and not otherwise. Moreover, it would amount to changing the terms and conditions of service which could not be done without resorting to Section 9A of the I.D. Act.

On behalf of the management reliance was placed on Ext. M5 which is an extract of promotion policy. This extract was provided by MW. 1. Through this document the management tried to prove that as a matter of policy a certain category of employees had to pass departmental examination before their promotion. Ext. M5 itself does not show the date on which the policy was formulated. But even then this document shows that it was applicable to employees having pay scale of Rs. 550—1100. It is admitted position that the post of Asstt. Accounts Officer is in the grade of Rs. 400—900 only. Obviously, this promotion policy is not applicable to the case of the workmen concerned.

It has been contended by Shri T.P. Choudhury that since the concerned workman had appeared to the departmental examination it should be regarded as acquiescence on his part and therefore he could not agitate the same question in this reference. I do not think that such an argument is entertainable for the simple reason that the concerned workman had been raising protest against his being forced to appear at the departmental examination and only when he was threatened with removal he took up some examinations.

It has been pleaded in the written statement of the management that the reference was incompetent for the reason that it is barred by res judicata. I do not think that this plea is at all available to the management for the simple reason that according to the High Court judgement the Civil Court had no jurisdiction whatsoever. Moreover, on question of fact the matter could not be decided in the Civil Court so as to operate as res judicata in this reference.

It has been next sponsored on behalf of the management that the union which has sponsored this reference is not at all active or in existence and therefore the union has no locus standi to fight this case. No evidence in this connection has been adduced on behalf of the management and Shri T. P. Choudhury, Advocate has conceded that he will not put any stress on this point. It is clear that the reference is competent.

Thus, having considered all the aspects of the case, I have come to the following conclusion :

- (1) The action of the management of Central Coal Washeries Organisation, Steel Authority of India Limited, At and Post Office Seraidhella (Dhanbad) in not confirming/promoting Shri Jatadhar Lal on the ground that he had not passed departmental examination for the post of Accountant as prescribed in the company's circular letter No. IISL/C1-D/61 dated 18-4-1961, is unjustified.
- (2) In normal course the concerned workman Shri Jatadhar Lal should have been confirmed on completion of his probationary period for one year from the date of his appointment and should have been promoted as Assistant Accounts Officer with effect from November, 1964 when Shri P.V. Venkateshan, an Accountant junior to him was promoted as Assistant Accounts Officer. The protest of Shri Jatadhar Lal to the management went unnoticed.

Shri Jatadhar Lal is, therefore entitled to be confirmed on completion of his probationary period for one year from the date of his appointment and also is entitled to promotion as Assistant Accounts Officer w.e.f. November, 1964 with all the attendant benefits and consequences arising out of such promotion including further promotion to higher post.

This is my award.

J. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer  
[No. L-20012(239)/78-D.III(A)]  
S. H. S. IYER, Desk Officer

#### आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 22 फरवरी, 1980

का० प्रा० 557.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाखण्ड अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में भारतीय स्टेट बैंक, हैदराबाद के नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्दिष्ट करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ब) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री एम० श्रीनिवास राव होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्दिष्ट करती है ।

#### अनुसूची

"क्या भारतीय स्टेट बैंक, गणनाधरम के प्रबन्धन की श्री एम० ए० बी० एस० भंजनामूलु, अस्थाई खंजारी की सेवाओं को 1-5-1971 से समाप्त करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है ?"

यदि नहीं, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुबोध का हकदार है ।"

[सं० एल०-12012/3/79-बी० II ए०]  
एल० के० नारायणन, अवर सचिव

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 22nd February, 1980

S.O. 557.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the State Bank of India, Hyderabad and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the

Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri M. Srinivasa Rao shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

#### SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of management of State Bank of India, Gannavaram in terminating the services of Shri N. A. V. S. S. Anjaneyulu, Temporary Cashier with effect from 1-5-71 is justified. If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

[No. L-12012/3/79-D. II(A)]

L. K. NARAYANAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 फरवरी, 1980

का० प्रा० 558.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, खान अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 35) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा वन शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के अब मंत्रालय को अधिसूचना संख्या का० प्रा० 3163, दिनांक 31 अगस्त, 1979 का अधिकरण करने हुए, निम्नलिखित अधिकारियों को मुख्य खान निरीक्षण के अधीन खान निरीक्षक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है, अर्थात्:—

1. श्री आर० सी० शर्मा, ग्रुप ए  
कल्याण आयुक्त,  
अभ्रक खान अभ्र कल्याण संस्था,  
भीलवाड़ा, राजस्थान ।
2. श्री जी० पी० शर्मा, ग्रुप बी  
कल्याण प्रशासक,  
कल्याण आयुक्त का कार्यालय,  
भारत सरकार,  
भीलवाड़ा क्षेत्र,  
भीलवाड़ा ।

[संख्या एम० 22025/1/78-एम० 3]

जगदीश प्रसाद, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd February, 1980

S.O. 558.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-Section (1) of section 5 of the Mines Act, 1952 (35 of 1952) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 3163 dated the 31st August, 1979, the Central Government hereby appoints the following officers to be Inspector of Mines subordinate to the Chief Inspector of Mines, namely:—

1. Shri R. C. Sharma, Group 'A'  
Welfare Commissioner  
Mica Mines Labour Welfare  
Organisation, Bhilwara,  
Rajasthan.
2. Shri G. P. Sharma, Group 'B'  
Welfare Administrator,  
Office of the Welfare Commissioner,  
Government of India, Bhilwara, Region  
Bhilwara.

[F. No. S. 22025(1)/78-MIII]

JAGDISH PRASAD, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 25 फरवरी, 1980

का० प्रा० 559.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, न्यूनतम मजदूरी अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 11) की धारा 26 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निदेश देती है कि इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से पांच वर्ष श्री अवधि के लिए, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 18 की उपधारा (1) का उपबन्ध अहां तक कि वह न्यूनतम मजदूरी (केन्द्रीय) नियम, 1950 द्वारा बिहित प्ररूप X में मजदूरी रजिस्टर के रजि जाने की अपेक्षा करता है, रखा

मन्त्रालय के अधीन सरकारी आईनेस विभाग या आईनेस उपस्कर कारखानों के कर्मचारियों के सम्बन्ध में, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा अनुसूचित समय-वर्तमान के हैं और जो किसी अनुसूचित नियोजन में नियोजित हैं तथा जिनके लिए उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन मजदूरी की न्यूनतम दरें नियत की गई हैं, इस शर्त के अधीन रहते हुए लागू नहीं होगा कि न्यूनतम मजदूरी (केन्द्रीय) नियम, 1950 के अधीन विहित मजदूरी रजिस्टर के बदले में आईनेस कारखानों की लेखा प्रक्रिया के अधीन विहित प्रकृत मजदूरी रजिस्टर रखा जाए।

[एस० 32014(2)/78-इन्फ्लू०सी० (एम०डब्ल्यू०)]

New Delhi, the 25th February, 1980

S.O. 559.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) section 26 of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (11 of 1948), the Central Government hereby directs that, for a period of five years from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette, the provision of sub-section (1) of section 18 of the said Act, in so far as it requires a Register of Wages to be maintained in Form X, prescribed by the Minimum Wages (Central) Rules, 1950, shall not apply in relation to the employees of the Ordnance Equipment Factories under the Ministry of Defence who are on time scale of pay approved by the Central Government and are employed in any scheduled employment, for whom minimum rates of wages have been fixed under the said Act, subject to the condition that a register of wages is maintained in the form prescribed under the account procedure of the Ordnance Factories in lieu of Register of Wages prescribed under the Minimum Wages (Central) Rules, 1950.

[S. 32014(2)/78-WC(MW)]

का० प्रा० 560.—न्यूनतम मजदूरी अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 11) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (iii) के साथ पठित धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ख) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने इसमें उपाबद्ध अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 2 में विनिर्दिष्ट मजदूरी की न्यूनतम दरों को जो उक्त अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 1 की सहायनी प्रविष्टियों में विनिर्दिष्ट मैगनीज खानों में उनके नियोजन में नियोजित प्रवर्ग के कर्मचारियों को संदेय हैं, पुनरीक्षित करने के लिए निम्नलिखित प्रस्ताव बनाए हैं जो उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ख) की अपेक्षानुसार उन सभी व्यक्तियों की जानकारी के लिए प्रकाशित किए जा रहे हैं, जिनके उससे प्रभावित होने की संभावना है और यह सूचना दी जाती है कि उक्त प्रस्तावों पर उस सारोक्ष से, जिस को उम राजपत्र की जिसमें यह अधिसूचना प्रकाशित होती है, प्रति जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, वो मास के अवसान के पश्चात् विचार किया जाएगा।

ऊपर विनिर्दिष्ट अवधि के अवसान से पूर्व उक्त प्रस्तावों की बाबत जो भी आपत्ति या सुझाव किसी व्यक्ति से प्राप्त होंगे, केन्द्रीय सरकार उन पर विचार करेगी।

#### अनुसूची

कार्य का वर्गीकरण	दैनिक मजदूरी की न्यूनतम दरें
(1)	(2)

#### मैगनीज खान

अकुशल	रु० पै०
(1) आया (2) बटलर (3) रखवाला (4) चौकीदार (5) क्लोनर (6) ड्रेसर (7) मजदूर (8) लीडर	6. 65

(9) मजदूर (पुरुष/स्त्री) (10) मदेशवाहक (11) नम्बर टैकर (12) कार्यालय पंक्तिर (13) जपगनी (14) पिकर (पुरुष/स्त्री) (15) छटाईकार (16) आइकण (पुरुष/स्त्री) (17) टिप्पर (18) टालीवाला (19) टाली टिप्पर (20) जलवाहक (21) अन्य प्रवर्ग जो अकुशल हैं चाहे वे किसी भी नाम से ज्ञात हों।

#### अर्धकुशल/अकुशल पर्यवेक्षी

(1) बैकमैन (2) बैकमैन (3) रोकड़ गाई (4) बैकर (5) रमोडिया (6) धोबी (पुरुष/स्त्री) (7) फायरमेन (8) ग्रीजर (9) ग्राइंडर (10) हथोड़िया (11) मददगार (बट्टई, यशार प्रचालक) (12) जमादार (13) खलासी (बुलबोजर आदि) (14) कक्ष प्रभारी (15) सेट माशी (एम०एम० नियम, 1961 के अधीन प्रमाणपत्र सहित) (16) निविकीय कर्मचारी जो मैट्रिकुलेट न हों (17) तैलवाला (18) प्लाइवुड मैन (19) सेम्पलर (20) भण्डारक अन्य प्रवर्ग जो अर्ध-कुशल/अकुशल पर्यवेक्षी हैं चाहे वे किसी भी नाम से ज्ञात हों।

#### कुशल

(1) अंतर्वर (2) अर्मकार (3) उत्तकोटक (घाट फायरर) (4) बट्टई (5) बार्जमैन (6) रमायनज्ञ (7) कस्वाउण्डर (8) गिअर, परिचर (9) नक्शातबीस (10) ड्रिलर (11) ड्राइवर (12) बिजली मिसत्री (13) फिटर (14) फोरमैन (15) राजगीर (16) यांत्रिक (17) दायी (18) मिसत्री (19) सांचेकार (20) प्रचालक (21) ओवरसीयर (22) गेंटर (23) पार्टिप फिटर (24) पर्यवेक्षक (25) मर्वेक्षक (26) टैलकार (27) टिम्बरमैन (28) टर्नर (29) वेल्डर (30) बायरमैन (31) बर्क सारकर (32) अन्य प्रवर्ग जो कुशल हैं चाहे वे किसी भी नाम से ज्ञात हों।

#### लिपिकीय

(1) रोकड़िया (2) लिपिक (3) रजिस्टर कीवर (4) बंडारी (5) अध्यापक (6) टाइप कीवर (7) टंकक (8) अन्य प्रवर्ग जो लिपिकीय हैं चाहे वे किसी भी नाम से ज्ञात हों।

स्पष्टीकरण : इस अधिसूचना के प्रयोजन के लिए—

1. इस अधिसूचना द्वारा नियत न्यूनतम दरें सर्व सम्मिलित दरें हैं जिनमें आधारी दर, जीवन निर्वाह भत्ता, आवश्यक बन्धुओं के रियायत पर किए गए प्रदायों, यदि कोई हो का नकदी मूल्य सम्मिलित हैं तथा मासिक विश्राम के लिए देय मजदूरी भी सम्मिलित है।

2. इस अधिसूचना द्वारा नियत मजदूरी की न्यूनतम दरें ठेकेदारों द्वारा नियोजित कर्मचारियों को भी लागू हैं।

3. अठारह वर्ष से कम आयु के और असमर्थ व्यक्तियों को देय मजदूरी की न्यूनतम दरें समुचित प्रवर्ग के कर्मचारियों के लिए, इस अधिसूचना द्वारा नियत दरों का क्रमशः 80 प्रतिशत और 70 प्रतिशत होंगी।

4. इस अधिसूचना के प्रयोजनों के लिए,—

(क) "अकुशल कार्य" से वह कार्य समिप्रेत है जिसमें बहुत थोड़ी या कुछ भी कुशलता का अनुभव अपेक्षित न करने वाली साधारण क्रियाएं सम्मिलित हैं,

(ख) "अर्ध कुशल कार्य" से वह कार्य अभिप्रेत हैं, जिसमें कार्य के अनुभव से अर्जित कुछ मात्रा में कुशलता या सक्षमता नमिस्तित है और जो कुशल कर्मचारी के पर्यवेक्षण या मार्ग दर्शन के अधीन किए जाने योग्य हैं और इसके अन्तर्गत अकुशल पर्यवेक्षी कार्य भी आता है

(ग) कुशल कार्य से वह कार्य अभिप्रेत है जिनमें कार्य के अनुभव से अथवा शिक्षा के रूप में या किसी तकनीकी या व्यावसायिक संस्था में प्रशिक्षण के माध्यम से अर्जित कुशलता या सक्षमता अपेक्षित हैं जिसके पालन से स्वप्रेरणा और विवेकबुद्धि आवश्यक हैं।

5. जहाँ संविधा या करार पर आधारित मजदूरी की विद्यमान दरें इस अधिसूचना द्वारा नियत दरों से उच्चतर हैं वहाँ ऐसी उच्चतर दरें इस अधिसूचना के प्रयोजनार्थ न्यूनतम मजदूरी की दरें समझी जाएंगी।

[एस 32019(9)/79-इस्यू सो (एम इस्यू)]

S.O. 560.—The following proposals made by the Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (I) of section 3 read with clause (iii) of sub-section (I) of section 4 of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (11 of 1948), for revising the minimum rates of wages as specified in column 2 of the Schedule annexed hereto, payable to the categories of employees employed in the employment of manganese mines specified in the corresponding entries in column 1 of the said Schedule, are hereby published, as required by clause (b) of sub-section (I) of section 5 of the said Act for information of all persons likely to be affected thereby and notice is hereby given that the said proposals shall be taken into consideration after the expiry of two months from the date on which the Gazette containing this notification is made available to the public.

Any objection or suggestion which may be received from any person with respect to the said proposals before the expiry of period specified above will be considered by the Central Government.

#### SCHEDULE

Classification of work	Minimum rates of wages per day
1	2

#### Manganese Mines

##### Unskilled

(1) Ayah, (2) Butler, (3) Care taker, (4) Chowkidar, (5) Cleaner, (6) Dresser, (7) Labourer, (8) Loader, (9) Mazdoor (Male/Female), (10) Messenger, (11) Numbertaker, (12) Office Boy, (13) Peon, (14) Picker (Male/Female), (15) Sorter, (16) Sweeper (Male/Female), (17) Trammer, (18) Trolleyman, (19) Trolley triper, (20) Water Carrier, (21) Other categories by whatever name called which are unskilled.

Rs. 6.65

##### Semi-skilled/Unskilled Supervisory

(1) Bankman, (2) Brakesman (3) Cash Guards, (4) Checker, (5) Cook, (6) Dhobi (Male/Female), (7) Fireman, (8) Greaser, (9) Grinder, (10) Hammerman, (11) Helper, (Carpenter, Crusher operator), (12) Jamadar, (13) Khalasi

Rs. 8.35

(Buldozer, etc.), (14) Lamp Room Incharge, (15) Mate/Mali (with competency certificate under MMR 1961), (16) Clerk, who is not Matriculate (17) Oilman (18) Pointsman, (19) Sampler, (20) Storeman, Other categories by whatever name Unskilled which are semi-skilled/supervisory.

##### Skilled

(1) Asayer, (2) Black-smith, (3) Blaster (Shot Firer), (4) Carpenter, (5) Chargemen, (6) Chemist, (7) Compounder, (8) Creche Attendant, (9) Draughtsman, (10) Driller, (11) Driver, (12) Electrician, (13) Fitter, (14) Foreman, (15) Mason, (16) Mechanic, (17) Midwife, (18) Mistry, (19) Moulder, (20) Operator, (21) Overseer, (22) Painter, (23) Pipe-Fitter, (24) Supervisor, (25) Surveyor, (26) Tin-smith, (27) Timbermen, (28) Turner, (29) Welder, (30) Wiremen, (31) Work-Sarker, (32) Other categories by whatever name called which are skilled.

Rs. 10.35

##### Clerical

(1) Cashier, (2) Clerk, (3) Register-Keeper, (4) Store-keeper, (6) Teacher, (6) Time-keeper, (7) Typist, (8) Other categories by whatever name called which are clerical.

Rs. 10.00

#### Explanations for the purposes of this notification

(1) The minimum rates of wages are all inclusive rates including the basic rate, the cost of living allowance and the cash value of the concessional supply, if any, of essential commodities and include also the wages payable for the weekly day of rest.

(2) The minimum rates of wages are applicable to employees employed by contractors also.

(3) The minimum rates of wages for young persons below 18 years of age and disabled persons shall be 80% and 70% respectively of the rates fixed by this notification for adult workers of the appropriate category.

(4) (a) Unskilled work means work which involves simple operations requiring little or no skills or experience on the job;

(b) Semi-skilled work means work which involves some degree of skills or competence acquired through experience on the job and which is capable of being performed under the supervision or guidance of a skilled employee, and includes unskilled supervisory work;

(c) Skilled work means work which involves skill or competence acquired through experience on the job or through training as an apprentice or in a technical or vocational institute and the performance of which calls for initiative and judgment.

(5) Where the prevailing rates of wages of any employee is higher than the rates notified herein, the higher wages shall be treated as the minimum rates of wages applicable for the purpose of this notification to such employee.

[S-32019(9)/79-WC(MW)]

नई दिल्ली, 27 फरवरी, 1980

का० प्रा० 561.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की यह राय है कि न्यूनतम मजदूरी अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 11) के अधीन ग्रेनाइट खानों में नियोजन बाधक मजदूरी की न्यूनतम दरें नियत की जाती चाहिए ;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 27 द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त नियोजन को उक्त अधिनियम की अनुसूची के भाग 1 में जोड़ने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है।

इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से तीन मास की अवधि के अवसान पर या उससे पूर्व उक्त नियोजन के जोड़े जाने की

बाबत किसी व्यक्ति से जो भी सुझाव या आपत्तियाँ प्राप्त होंगी केन्द्रीय सरकार उन पर विचार करेगी।

[सं० एम० 32017(3)/78-इन्फ्यू०सी०(एम० डब्ल्यू०)]

New Delhi, the 27th February, 1980

**S.O. 561.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that the minimum rates of wages should be fixed under the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (11 of 1948) in respect of employment in granite mines ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 27 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to add the said employment to Part I of the Schedule to the said Act.

Any suggestions or objections which may be received from any person in respect of the said addition on or before the expiry of a period of three months from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette, will be considered by the Central Government.

[No. S. 32017(3)/78-WC(MW)]

नई दिल्ली, 28 फरवरी, 1980

क्र०आ० 562.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, न्यूनतम मजदूरी अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 11) की धारा 26 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निर्देश देती है कि इस अधिसूचना के

राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से पाँच वर्ष की अवधि के लिए उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 18 की उपधारा (1) के उपबन्ध, जहाँ तक कि उनमें यह श्रवेषा की गई है कि विहित प्रसंगों में, अर्थात्, न्यूनतम मजदूरी (केन्द्रीय) नियम, 1950 के प्ररूप 4, 5 और 10 में, प्रतिकाल, मस्टर रोल और मजदूरी रजिस्टर रखे जाएँ, मुम्बई पत्तन न्यास के सम्पत्ता विधि मुख्य यांत्रिक इंजीनियर, मुख्य इंजीनियर, चिकित्सा और श्रम विभागों के कर्मचारियों के संबंध में जिनके लिए उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन मजदूरी की न्यूनतम दरें नियत की गई हैं, इस शर्त के अधीन रहते हुए लागू नहीं होंगे कि ऐसे कर्मचारियों की विविधियाँ प्ररूप छ-14-ख/1 में, जो इस अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में उपवर्णित हैं, रखी जाएँ और जो न्यूनतम मजदूरी अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 11) और न्यूनतम मजदूरी (केन्द्रीय) नियम, 1950 के प्रयोजनार्थ प्रतिकाल, मस्टर रोल और मजदूरी रजिस्टर समझा जाएँ, और शर्त यह भी होगी कि भिन्न-भिन्न तारीखों को किसी कर्मकार द्वारा किए गए प्रतिकाल कार्य के घण्टों की संख्या तथा उस कर्मकार द्वारा एक मास में किए गए कुल प्रतिकाल कार्य-प्रस्थापित प्ररूप के क्रमशः स्तंभ 10 और 16 के अधीन उस पंक्ति के, जिसमें कर्मकार का नाम लिखा जाता है, ठीक पश्चात्तवर्ती पंक्ति में उपदर्शित किया जाएगा।

#### अनुसूची

..... मास के लिए मस्टर रोल

छ-14ख/1

पी०एफ० खाता संख्या	क्रम सं०	आकस्मिक छुट्टी	वैकल्पिक छुट्टी	पदनाम	संदेय न्यूनतम मजदूरी की दर, प्राधान्य की तारीख	पिता/पति के नाम सहित कर्मचारी का नाम	टिकट संख्या	पुरुष या महिला	1	2	3	4	5	6
					प्रथम नियुक्ति की तारीख	महंगाई भत्ता								

#### बेतनमान

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

10

न्यूनतम मजदूरी		प्रतिकाल दर		प्रति सप्ताह सामान्य घण्टे	दिनों/घंटों की सं० जिन के लिए प्रतिकाल प्रयुज्य है	कुल हाजिरी/किए गए काम की इकाइयाँ	बेतन की दर	बेतन	
रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०		एम०डब्ल्यू०पी०टी० घंटा०				
11		12		13	14	15	16	17	18

ब्राह्मन् में संवत् मजदूरी की दर												कटौतियां							
कार्यकारी भत्ता		अन्य भत्ते, विशेष वेतन आदि		प्रतिकरात्मक (नगर) भत्ता		महंगाई भत्ता		समान किराया भत्ता		अनिकान		राशि अधि-प्रतिनिधित्व		सकल संदेय मजदूरी		भविष्य निधि भविष्य भ्रंशदायी भविष्य निधि द्वारा शासित कार्यकारी			
रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०		
19		20		21		22		23		24		25		26		27		28	

कटौतियां															
भविष्य निधि	स्वेच्छिक	भविष्य निधि	आई०पी०	आयभर	महकारी प्रत्यय	वेतन बचत	कर्मचारी का	वेतन ऊर्जा	अन्य कटौतियां	त्योहार					
अभिदाय, पेशन	भविष्य निधि	अग्रिम	और एम०		सोसाइटी	स्कीम	किराया		अग्रिम	आदि					
स्कीम द्वारा	अभिदाय		पी०पी०												
शासित कर्मचारी															
रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०		
29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38						

कटौतियां											
वेतन रोल बचत स्कीम		श्रीड़ा क्लब और रेनोल्ड क्लब		कुल कटौतियां		वास्तविक संदेय मजदूरी		अतिरिक्त संवाय की तारीख		टिप्पणियां	
रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०	रु०	पै०		
39		40		41		42		43		44	

[सं० एम०-32014(2)/79-इस्यू०सी०(एम० इस्यू०)]

अशोक नारायण, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 28th February, 1980

**S.O. 562.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 26 of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (11 of 1948), the Central Government hereby directs that for a period of five years from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette, the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 18 of the said Act, in so far as it requires a Register of Overtime Muster Roll and Register of Wages to be maintained in the prescribed forms, namely, Forms IV, V and X of the Minimum Wages (Central) Rules, 1950 shall not apply in relation to the employees of the Estate, the Legal, the Chief Mechanical Engineer's, the Chief Engineer's, the Medical and the Labour Departments of

Bombay Port Trust, for whom minimum rates of wages have been fixed under the said Act, subject to the condition that particulars of such employees shall be maintained in Form G 14B/1 which is set out in the Schedule to this notification and which shall be deemed to be the Register of Overtime, Muster Roll and Register of Wages for the purpose of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (11 of 1948) and the Minimum Wages (Central) Rules, 1950 and subject also to the condition that the number of hours of overtime put in by a worker on different dates as well as the total of overtime work put in by the workers in a month shall be indicated in the proposed form under columns 10 and 16 respectively in the line immediately following the line on which the name of the worker is entered.

## SCHEDULE

Muster Roll for the month of .....

G14B/1

P.F. Account No.	Sr. No.	Casual Leave	Optional Hoslidays	Designation	Rate of Minimum Wages Payable Basic + D.A.	Name of the Employee with Father's/Husband's Name	Ticket No.	Sex
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

Minimum Wage Rate		Overtime Rate		Normal Hrs. per week	No. of days/Hrs. for which overtime is admissible		Total attendance/ Unit of work done	Rate of Pay		Pay	
Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.		M.W.A.	P.T.R.				Rs.	P.
11		12		13	14	15	16	17		18	

## Rate of Wages Actually Paid

Acting Allowance		Other Allowances Sp. Pay etc.		Compensatory (City) Allowance		Dearness Allowance		House Rent Allowance		Over-time		Night Weightage	
Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	M.W.A. Rs.	P.	P.T.R. Rs.	P.
19		20		21		22		23		24		25	

Gross wages Payable		Deductions													
		P.F. Contr. employees governed by Cent. P.F. Scheme		P.F. Contr. Employees governed by Pension Scheme		V.P.F. Subscription		P.F. Advance		I.P. & S.I.P.		Income-Tax		Co-op. Credit Society	
Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
27		28		29		30		31		32		33		34	

Deductions													
Salary Savings Scheme		Rent for Quarters		Electric Energy		Other Deductions Festival Adv. etc.		Pay Roll Savings Scheme		Sports Club Reynold's Inst.		Total Deductions	
Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
35		36		37		38		39		40		41	

Actual Wages Payable		Date of O.T. Payment		Remarks
Rs.	P.			
42		43		44

[No. S. 32014(2)/79-WC(MW)]  
ASHOK NARAYAN, Dy. Secy.

2

1

2

1

2

1

2





# भारत का राजपत्र

## The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 11]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, मार्च 15, 1980/फाल्गुन 25, 1901

No 11]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, MARCH 15, 1980/PHALGUNA 25, 1901

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके  
Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़ कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्यक्षेत्र प्रशासनों को छोड़ कर)  
केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं

Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India  
(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities (other than the  
Administrations of Union Territories)

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 1980

का०आ० 563.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए माधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 72-मऊगंज निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री काशीनाथ, ग्राम-पतियारी, पो० बरहुटा, रीवा, जिला रीवा (मध्य प्रदेश) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, समयक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्याख्यान नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री काशीनाथ को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० म०प्र०-वि०स० 72/77]

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 11th February, 1980

S.O. 563.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Kashi Nath, Village—Patiyari, P.O.—Barhata, Rewa, District—Rewa, Madhya Pradesh, a contesting candidate for general election to the Madhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 72-Mauganj constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and